DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 081 108 EA 005 393

TITLE	National Seminar on Year-Round Education.
INSTITUTION	Clarion State Coll., Pa.; Pennsylvania State Dept. of Education, Harrisburg.
PUB DATE	Apr 70
NOTE	137p.; Speeches given before seminar on Year-Round Education (2nd, Harrisburg, Penna., April 5-7, 1970) Related documents are EA 005 392 and 394
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$6.58
DESCRIPTORS	Case Studies; *Conference Reports; Cost Effectiveness; *Curriculum Development; Educational Finance; Program Budgeting; *Program Design; School Calendars; School Schedules; Space Utilization; Student Needs; *Year Round Schools

ABSTRACT

Presented here in chronological order, are all the speeches given at the conference. Topics discussed include year-round use of schools as they relate to the needs of youth, basic designs for year-round education, major developments across the nation, projecting savings in classroom space or dollars through rescheduling the school year, year-round programs now operating, and major thrusts for year-round education. Included in the document is a position paper on year-round education adopted by the conference participants. The appendixes include a seminar evaluation report, the NEA proposed statement on year-round education, and the National Conference of Lieutenant Governors resolution on year-round education. (Photographs and xeroxed copy may reproduce poorly.) (Author/DN)

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

ED 081108

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

SECOND NATIONAL

SEMINAR ON YEAR-ROUND EDUCATION

PENN HARRIS HOTEL Harrisburg, Penna. APRIL 5,6,7,1970

Sponsored By

PENNSYLVANIA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

AND CLARION STATE COLLEGE

EA 005 393



Second
National

SEMINAR on YEAR-ROUND EDUCATION



COMMITTEES

NATIONAL PLANNING COMMITTEE

Andrew Adams
Director of Educational Affairs
VISTA

Fred Brieve
Associate Superintendent of Instruction
Dallas Ind. School District

Reid Gillis
Coordinator of Year-Round Ed.
Fulton County, Georgia

Ann Grooms
Executive Director
Educational Services Institute
Cincinnati, Ohio

Winslow Hatch
Bureau of Research
US Office of Education

George Jensen, Chairman
Nat. School Calendar Study Com.
Minneapolis

John D. McLain, Chairman
Director Research-Learning Center
Clarion State College
Clarion, Pennsylvania

Stuart North
College of Education
University of Houston

George Thomas
Coordinator of Year-Round Ed.
N. Y. State Department of Ed.

Wayne H. White, Superintendent
Brevard County Schools, Fla. and
Director, First National Seminar on
Year-Round Education

Oz Johnson
Ass't Superintendent for Research
Jefferson County Schools, Ky.

PENNA. STATE COMMITTEE

Harry Benedetto
Coordinator, Production and Dis.
Bureau of Instructional Ser., PDE

Donald M. Carroll, Jr.
Ass't Commissioner of Basic Ed.
PDE

Herbert Edwards
Assistant Director
Div. of Compensatory Pro., PDE

Edward Grissinger
Bureau of Adm. Leadership Ser.
PDE

Ernest Johnson
Dir. of Ed. Development Center
University of Pittsburgh at Johnstown

John L. Kennedy
Dir., Bureau of Curriculum Dev.
and Evaluation, PDE

Everett A. Landin
Dir. Ed. Development Center
West Chester State College

John McLain, Chairman

Carl Newman
Supervising Prin., N. Allegheny
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania

Tillman Wenk, Assistant Director
Bureau of Curriculum Dev.
and Evaluation, PDE

H. Stanley Wills
Director of Basic Education
Penna. State Ed. Association

CLARION STATE COLLEGE COMMITTEE

Don Morgan, Assistant Director
Field Services

Ernest Rice, Assistant Director
College Services

Don Means, Assistant Director
Educational Development

Don McKelvey, Assistant Director
Reg. Planning. ESEA Title III

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

SEMINAR COMMITTEES

OPENING BANQUET
Welcome: Dr. B. Anton Hess. 1
Presiding: John L. Kennedy. 3
Address: YEAR-ROUND USE OF SCHOOLS AS THEY RELATE TO THE NEEDS OF YOUTH by Dr. Charles H. Boehm. 5

FIRST GENERAL SESSION
Welcome: Dr. James Gemmell. 13
Presiding: Donald M. Carroll. 15
ADDRESS by Lieutenant Governor Raymond J. Broderick. 17
BASIC DESIGNS FOR YEAR-ROUND EDUCATION by Andrew Adams. 21
MAJOR DEVELOPMENTS ACROSS THE NATION by George M. Jensen. . . . 29
DESIGNING A YEAR-ROUND PROGRAM TO MEET LOCAL NEEDS by Kenneth Hermansen. 39

SECOND GENERAL SESSION
Presiding: Dale Weizenecker. 47
YEAR-ROUND PROGRAMS IN GEORGIA by Reid Gillis. 49
PROJECTING SAVINGS IN CLASSROOM SPACE OR DOLLARS THROUGH RESCHEDULING THE SCHOOL YEAR by George Thomas. 59

DINNER SESSION
Presiding: Herbert J. Edwards. 90
MAJOR THRUSTS FOR YEAR-ROUND EDUCATION by Dr. John D. McLain. . 93
STATEMENT ON YEAR-ROUND EDUCATION adopted by Seminar. 98
COMMENTS BY REACTOR PANEL. 100

CLOSING SESSION
Presiding: Tillman E. Wenk. 103
SUMMARY OF CONFERENCE by Dr. Ann Grooms. 105
CONCLUSIONS by John L. Kennedy. 107

APPENDIX A
Seminar Evaluation Report. 109

APPENDIX B
PROPOSED STATEMENT ON YEAR-ROUND EDUCATION
Association of Classroom Teachers, NEA. 111

APPENDIX C
RESOLUTION ON YEAR-ROUND EDUCATION
National Conference of Lieutenant Governors. 113

APPENDIX D
LIST OF PARTICIPANTS
Second National Seminar on Year-Round Education. 115

OPENING BANQUET

Welcome: Dr. B. Anton Hess
Deputy Secretary and Commissioner
for Basic Education
Pennsylvania Department of Education

OPENING BANQUET
Welcome: Dr. B. Anton Hess

Mr. Kennedy, Dr. Boehm, distinguished guests at the Head Table, and members of the Second National Seminar on Year-Round Education-- I am delighted to be with you this evening to welcome you to Harrisburg, to Pennsylvania and to this significant conference.

As I look over your agenda, I am excited about the potential that the topics for presentation and discussion hold for the improvement of education in America.

I have been doing some reading lately that has been somewhat frightening. I've read President Nixon's message on educational reform to the Congress of the United States in which he begins with the succinct statement, "American education is in urgent need of reform. A nation justly proud of the dedicated efforts of its millions of teachers and educators must join them in a searching re-examination of our entire approach to learning." I also recently read Francis Kepple's book, The Notions Revolution in American Education, in which he says, "The first revolution in American education was the revolution in quantity. Everyone was to be provided the chance for an education of some sort. That revolution is almost won in the school and is on its way in higher education. The second revolution is equality of opportunity. That solution (embodied in our rejuvenated concern for civil rights) is well under way. The next turn of the wheel must be a revolution in quality. I have been reading economist Peter Drucker's book entitled, The Age of Discontinuity. Mr. Drucker says, "A crisis is at hand in education. Within the next decade it will be changed because it is headed straight into a major economic crisis, is indeed deep in it. It is not that we cannot afford the high costs of education -- we cannot afford the low productivity."

Just last week, I received the March issue of Phi Delta Kappan which deals with a curriculum for the 70's. I was particularly impressed with Dr. Arthur Foshay's article on How Fair the Disciplines? in which he concluded that education today must go beyond the understanding of subject matter. There must also be included the element of inquiry. He says, "Our secondary school students are rapidly challenging the concept of adolescence itself. They want to see themselves as participants in the world they live in, not as apprentices for it. They want the world to be in the school and the school in the world. We cannot meet that requirement by going back to the problem centered curriculum of a generation ago. We have to develop some new synthesis of what is real in the world with what is conceptual."

Although criticism is not new to those of us who have spent most of our lives creating broader programs of education for more and more children, we make a serious mistake if we shrug it off as being inconsequential. Since changing education means more than changing subjects or subject content and since curriculum development includes the how, the what, the why, and the when we teach; I submit that this conference has a significant contribution to make in unlocking doors to quality education of the future.

When the Pennsylvania General Assembly passed Act 80, which provided more flexibility to the rigid five and five and one-half hour day, it was done to enable school districts to expand programs of in-service education, parent-teacher conferences, curriculum seminars and number of days of instruction. It is, I believe an untenable anachronism in these times of urbanization and winter vacations to continue to effectively operate public schools only from 8:30 a.m. to 3:30 p.m. daily between September and June. I'm not at the moment recommending that compulsory education should be operating for all pupils, 365 days a year. I am, however, suggesting that we need to provide more educational opportunities at more times in new patterns so that a school building, like a thriving business, is a community institution whose productivity knows no bell schedule, recognizes no hiatus, and needs no vacation!

Let me not be misunderstood on this subject. I do not advocate formal classes all year for all pupils. I must emphasize this to rebut the many critical letters we receive from those who think we are unconcerned about the welfare of youth. Nor do I favor legislation which would require all schools in the Commonwealth to be open 12 months of the year. I would, however, covet a kind of flexibility to be available to all school districts so that they may do any of the following: (1) Extend the school year to fifths or quarters with each child attending four or three; (2) Operate 220 or 240 days with two shifts; (3) Operate an extensive reimbursable summer program including camps and outdoor education either cooperatively or unilaterally, and; (4) Any flexible arrangement of 180 days or more which meets requirements of 990 hours.

The impact of this on new approaches to individualized instruction, independent study, new curriculum endeavors, and more flexible attendance regulations is clearly evident.

I'm truly excited about the possibilities facing us today which I believe will tend to eliminate compartmentalization of time, classes, knowledge, and programs. Such transformations have begun in many places and provide a new and significant challenge to all of us.

May I extend to you my best wishes as you proceed through this conference. I hope that it will provide the springboard to educators across this land to restudy what we can do to improve evaluation, to change our instructional and staffing patterns, and to learn to manage the instruction of young people in a way that will permit them to function more effectively in this rapidly changing world.

OPENING BANQUET

Presiding: John L. Kennedy
Director, Bureau of Curriculum
Development and Evaluation
Pennsylvania Department of Education

OPENING BANQUET

Presiding: John L. Kennedy

Mr. Kennedy:

It is a great pleasure for me now to introduce to you our speaker of the evening, Dr. Charles H. Boehm. Dr. Boehm has a long and exciting list of accomplishments. He has served as a teacher, as a principal, as a chief school administrator and as Superintendent of Public Instruction in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. As you can see, Dr. Boehm has come up through the ranks. His background provides him with a platform of authority on which to talk about education. He has been very active in international affairs as it concerns education and is presently an educational planning consultant with Better Government Associates. We have consistently heard good things about Dr. Boehm in relation to working with school districts. He brings to them an expertise and a knowledge that not many people have. I truely believe he is well qualified to speak to you tonight on the subject that gathers us here tonight at this time. It gives me great pleasure to introduce Dr. Charles H. Boehm who will speak on "The Utilization of Schools, Year-Round to Meet the Needs of Children." Dr. Boehm.

OPENING BANQUET

Address: Dr. Charles H. Boehm
Superintendent, Pennsylvania Department of
Public Instruction, Emeritus

YEAR-ROUND USE OF SCHOOLS AS THEY RELATE TO THE NEEDS OF YOUTH

by

Dr. Charles H. Boehm

The first section of the title of my presentation tonight was Dr. Grissinger's and the second "to meet the needs of the students" was mine. This is to be expected as educational program and what happens to students has always been my primary concern. The purpose of this charge is to challenge your thinking with new perspectives. I am not going to review the excellent material which recently has been made available to you. Just this week the American Association of School Administrators has distributed a bulletin "9 Plus, The Year-Round School," which presents a review of the movement and an extensive bibliography. The February issue of the Pennsylvania School Journal also has a comprehensive article by your Chairman, Dr. John McLain, and a preview of the "21st Century School" planned for the new Research-Learning Center at Clarion State College. The New York State Education Department, and the Pennsylvania Department of Education have also published some interesting material.

I think it is well to recognize the joint sponsorship of this Seminar by the Pennsylvania Department of Education, this is a superb example of state leadership at its best. Commissioner of Basic Education, Dr. Anton Hess, and other members of the staff are here and appropriately occupy important positions on the program. Iowa's department is represented by a friend of mine tonight, Buford Garner, with whom I spend a most pleasant six weeks in Sweden.

In the past four years I have among other things been engaged in medical education research and I find it extremely helpful in connection with the studies in the prenatal and postnatal period and intelligence, the early childhood period and the primary education period. Educational problems and medical problems are often very closely related. While most of my attention recently has been directed to the SLOW LEARNER problems, I was lured last February to accept two positions on the program at Atlantic City of the AASA in connection with the extended school year. It was only natural for me to involve my recent recommendations to 18 school districts, which suggested that they initiate an "extruded" school term of 210 days for slow learners. While we must look for assistance in improving the lot of slow learners to the prenatal and post-natal eras, improved teacher competency, improved instructional materials, methods, pupil progression and parental involvement, we must also utilize the continuous school year for the slow learners.

At Atlantic City, I had the good fortune of meeting Reid Gillis who was on both programs and who was the expert. He has everything going for him - he is conscientious, open-minded and has an energetic personality. He comes from

the most delightful area of the Southeast, and he works for and with a very able, well known, and personable Dr. Paul West. Tonight I was delighted to meet Pennsylvania's expert, your Chairman, Dr. John McLain. I doubt whether anyone has written about the year-round school which I often refer to as the "School of all Seasons," more comprehensively or more lucidly. One of his publications has a Pennsylvania slant, it concerns CONSIDERATIONS FOR ECONOMY AND QUALITY EDUCATION THROUGH YEAR-ROUND SCHOOLS. Had he written it in New England the title undoubtedly would have been FOR QUALITY EDUCATION AND ECONOMY THROUGH YEAR-ROUND SCHOOLS. Had he been in California the title might have been FOR BETTER BASIC EDUCATION, ECONOMY AND LESS FRILLS THRU YEAR-ROUND SCHOOLS.

These documents he wrote are practical and down to earth. I think they are well organized and well written. His position today in this movement is well merited. Apart from the articles I would give him a very large diamond in his eternal crown hereafter for having developed the CLARION STATE COLLEGE RESEARCH-LEARNING CENTER as an instrumentality for educational development. His proposal for a year-round school permitting parents to enroll their children and take them out anytime for a vacation, an individualized curriculum and individual pupil progression simply appears as the TWENTY FIRST CENTURY SCHOOL NOW. The future is NOW AT CLARION. After all the pupils now in school will earn and live most of their lives in that century. The Research-Learning Centers at the 14 state owned higher education institutions are a sort of progeny of mine. Of the several types of innovative buildings I proposed at these institutions, the one which will have the best chance of bringing talent to Pennsylvania and reflecting glory upon William Penn's Commonwealth are not likely to be the Space Science Centers, the World Culture Buildings, or the Biological-Behavioral Science Centers but rather the RESEARCH-LEARNING CENTERS. As it appears at this time Clarion will make the first splash and have the greatest impact upon the growing edge of education.

I want to discuss three thoughts relative to the Year-Round School. The first relates to a layman's first thoughts when the Year-Round School is mentioned the economic aspect.

The second proposes a rather new thought in using the Year-Round School to provide uninterrupted learning for special groups in need of continuous learning, the slow learners and near dropouts and the handicapped, speech defectives and the adaptive physical education students.

The third is a plea to provide for overlay or parellel terms in July and August and in mid-winter or in fact whenever they may be desirable so as to give an opportunity for curriculum innovation and maximum flexibility in meeting the needs of children, youth, and adults.

Shall I pass over consideration for the enormous waste in public education and private education which accumulates annually in the daily use of our public and private property? How can we not regard the waste resulting from the lack of utilization of school buildings during the summer sunshine and rain for three long months? We have every right to be proud of most of these buildings which we utilize one-fourth of a day for 185 days in a year of 365 days.

Excepting in the days of local or national disaster when these facilities are open for the care of all, we reverently dedicate about 56 days a year of vacant facilities so that everyone may honor HIM, the great Architect of the Universe. When we defer to all religious groups we will have to double this number to 126 days. As we dedicate vacant days originally conceived as such to be used to appropriately for commemorating the lives of national heroes, we add about a dozen days. We include appropriate vacant days for Peace, our Honored Dead in the nation's declared and undeclared wars, memorializing Labor, and the great events in our nation's History. When we honor Mother, we take a Sunday and hence there are no vacant days added, but this trend did not continue when both labor and the recreation business aspects of our economic order joined in favor of longer weekends. It does no good to question the genuineness of some of our holidays which have seen professional sports effect a coup and emerge as the dominent force for more holidays.. They have even tried to move Labor Day and the opening of the traditional school term to the middle of September so that people would spend more in a longer recreation period. What matters is that we actually have used in toto some 120 days, with a comfortable 245 days left! At this conference, however, we will not become concerned with what I have just said but rather discourse upon the three months in summer when most of our school buildings and playgrounds and the sacred arena, the football stadia, and our all-weather gymnasiums are in moth balls. Fortunately, our swimming pools are not included in this tradition and are usually open 12 months of the year. We amortize the bond issue costs over 12 months but we charge it in our school cost to a 180-day term. The same goes for maintenance and certain operating expenses. This means that for every $10,000,000 plant not used for three months and amortized over 20 years or 30 years, there is in plain terms, a waste of potential use of facilities of as much as $150,000 a year.

The difficulty in achieving a basic modification of the present term to serve children especially is the natural propensity to oppose change. Those involved in educational planning prior to 1957, when the most famous dog of modern history began orbiting into space, were more or less concerned with providing an economical and general acceptable program for those who had the ability of profiting by a 12-year public education and who had the motivation to strive for that education. After Sputnik stimulated the most momentous self-criticism in our society the rules of the game changed as one focus led to another in a chain reaction from civil rights to educational rights. Educational rights began to include nearly all areas of the spectrum of human ability regardless of wealth or race. It may well be that the "black power" has won a significant skirmish in the second silent civil war as it won consideration for the children of the poor. It also unintentionally or intentionally won a momentous victory for every child regardless of mental capability and motivation as well as regardless of state of poverty or wealth.

Those who still argue that colleges or a post high school education are only for the qualified under pre-Sputnik conditions simply have not understood what has and is happening. They have equated open secondary and colleges to mean reduced standards and have not understood that recently transpired events have meant revised curricula, revised methodology, revised administrative procedures and a higher outlay for those who in the past have been subjected

to a restrictive environment. An environment blighted by a sordid insensitivity to the hopes and aspirations of all new born regardless of color of skin or residence of parents or regardless of family and community motivation and regardless of fiscal resources available to that particular school district.

Furthermore, members of this conference, this second civil war is not over and may continue in one form or another through the decades until the new programs and emphases are not only detailed but also operative. THIS WE CANNOT NOW ACCOMPLISH, for we do not know how! We have tentative cognitive guidelines and some directions towards the modification of intra-personal problems. Our primitive research work and rather primitive knowledge has not encompassed those who have not succeeded under the traditional school programs. In maximizing the educational development for our slow learners, and our stalled learners, we will also augment the program for the moderately paced learners and for the jet propelled fast learners as well!

I would like to dwell just for a moment on human waste by the lack of school these three summer months. You know, of course, today, and I think it is generally accepted fact that when create a distaste for learning we start children on the way to failure. Whenever we call attention to failure to those children who study, who learn slowly, we push them in that direction even faster. And when we fail to commend success with these youngsters and youth, they are at the brink; and when we add physical punishment to academic failure and a passionate hate for all academic learning we push them over the cliff and they do not want anything to do with school or academic learning for the rest of their life.

We inadvertently create a pool of dissatisfied youth who might give vent to their passions via violence in the streets. The ones who are unsuccessful in developing their ego, solving major intra-personal problems add to our burdens in early childhood without adding retardation in learning to our problems. Let us turn our attention to slow learners and other groups for whom interruption to the learning momentum is disastrous. Nothing can be more harmful to someone who is just beginning to move ahead and then to find out there is a layoff for June, July, and August. Unfortunately, with all the research funds available during the past few years in New York City or elsewhere in the nation where we have vast pool of experts, little or nothing has as yet been indicated as to what occurs with the slow learner during the June, July, and August lockout. Our usual test patterns cover the period from April to October. In terms of its impact upon these children, this lockout is unbelievable.

Several years ago on a presidential mission to Air Force Training bases in Texas I was impressed with the adjustments made for airmen who were learning at a slower pace than the normal group. They had 6-week and 8-week courses; the 8-week course, in fact, was an extruded course or term. The content, the examination and standards were identical. The only difference was the pace. They had not received any report from Southeast Asia in which the officers were able to <u>detect any difference in performance</u> between the airmen from either group. They were planning to treat the so-called McNamara men who had been previously rejected by the draft in the same arrangement which

would give them a reasonable pace. The first reports from Southeast Asia on the McNamara men were similar to the previous group. They could not identify the men who had taken the fast course from the slower paced courses.

When we add six or eight weeks to the term of the slow learner, in some extruded pattern, we may anticipate 20 to 25% gain in achievement. We can add a big plus by the reduction of loss of achievement level which we have reason to believe occurs when learning is interrupted for June, July and August. In the $10,000,000 federally funded, New York City project report, we read that while some groups reported very fine gains between October and April, "the spring to fall decline in achievement which was found to be so sharp as to wipe out any measureable school year gains."* It is unbelievable that no study was made of the actual loss for the vacation period.

To emphasize the status of reading in this state we refer to a testing program conducted a decade ago involving 17,500 seniors in 119 high schools. The list included two high schools from Philadelphia, two from Pittsburgh, and 115 other high schools selected at random. The results in mathematics indicated that the mass of scores were at the higher end of the curve so that at the top 2% level where we might expect 350 we actually had 2,540. In reading, the scores shifted to the lower end of the scale so that when the national norm for the top 2% was 350, we actually had only four!

I have been studying 16 cases of slow learners in the eighth grade for a school district in New Jersey. The IQ's range from 76 to 110 and all are slow learners. All had a period of three years in their eight years of schooling in which they stood virtually still in reading achievement.

I have just returned from an evaluation of a private academy in Pittsburgh where I concentrated upon their excellent reading program for grades 5 to 12 inclusive. Everyone had "reading" instruction every year. The average time was about two periods a week. Those who had a high level of achievement had special independent study assignments. All others had some form of reading instruction reinforcement. One boy whose reading level would have prevented him from graduating received special tutoring 12 months in the year and may now expect to be able to enter college. This is not a new experience but it does point up the tragedy of learning interruption for many pupils. In this private school nearly all pupils are progressing in reading and academic performance. Others are referred for special diagnosis to various specialists in the metropolitan area. Time does not permit me to tell you about the individual assessment of each child in the exciting secondary school where reading instruction is actually for each child in every year of high school.

You may apply the loss due to interrupted learning to the classes in speech correction, adaptive physical education, emotionally disturbed, and especially the multihandicapped or the physically handicapped. I had an office for several years located in a building with the physically handicapped. I became aware of the loss in achievement over the vacation and understood why summer camp was provided for them.

---

*Urban Review, February, 1969, p. 33.

I will proceed to another aspect. In connection with some of my recent activities I have interviewed some 320 teachers, seeking recommendations from them for their dream school. In three cases the student council was also included. In one rural and somewhat suburban district the student council included among four recommendations the following:

"We would like the following facilities open on Saturday's and twelve months in the year: (1) Library, (2) One or two science labs, (3) One or two shops, (4) Homemaking room, (5) Gymnasium and athletic fields (gym especially). Elegantly incontestable recommendations!"

A third area of concern is that in your deliberations you permit the superimposition of parallel terms so that innovations may be freely brought into the curriculum. These parallel terms might be for one month or two months in the summertime. In that time, lay people more readily accept new ideas. In the ninethteenth century we often used the basement for innovative enterprises. The first science laboratories were constructed in these substandard basement rooms. When they became respectable they moved upstairs and in came the shops and homemaking rooms. In many schools art, music and some commercial classes followed the same route. In fact the outside toilets were first located in the basement before they were brought upstairs.

In our basementless buildings we have had to use the summer school. We could provide a cheerleaders course in the summer school much easier than during the regular term. In one school the practical art teachers taught their seventh grade program to fifth and sixth graders during the summer. The program was so successful that a fundamental shift in curriculum is now under way in that area. We found that we can teach everyone to swim in six or eight weeks in the summer. Instruction in skiing too will require a flexible winter schedule. Driver education has often been introduced in the summertime.

In the preparation of football teams we have an extensive preschool arrangement so that these entertainers may be properly conditioned. Two-week camps are common. In the delightfully autumn spectacles the entertainment schedule includes pregame ceremonies, intermission entertainment, and a post-game review. We have expanded our marching entourage to include: baton twirlers, pompom dancers, pinwheel acrobats, medieval hearlders, color guards and a host of unnamed pageanteers. What we now need to do is to persuade the Latin teachers to give us a modern version of ancient Roman and Greek historical characters from Homer - a modern Dido, the three graces, and perhaps a dazzling Helen of Troy. If choreography is good for a few girls why not most girls? Using the month of August for choreography might well benefit all girls and give an assist to the "ego" development to many who need it. Such wholesome introductions might help retard the desire to expand their personality via drugs. Skiing and winter activities might be superimposed overlay on the December-January quarter term.

The compelling force of reality leads us to believe that times will no longer be the same as the rules of the game have changed. The seamless web which has wedded us to traditional patterns of the past has been broken. In the wake of adolescence are widely scattered myths, some sacred cows and a few tools and procedures which you and I have admired and used in the past.

In today's schools which purport to serve all children they are no longer useful. In the debris are such traditions as:

1. Entrance of pupils into formal education by a chronological age.
2. Assigning the same pupil load to first and second grade as we do the fifth and sixth.
3. The overall ranking system.
4. The 8:4, the 6:6 or the 6:3:3 or the 1:4, 5:8, 9:12 or any similar arrangement.
5. Hierarchial authoritarian procedures from whatever source.
6. The present use of the normal curve for grading.
7. Marking system.
8. Teacher and pupil term coterminous arrangement.
9. Fixed pupil and teacher term.
10. The focus of this Conference, the 180-200 day term.

When you return home you will choose a moderate direction or you may choose a more fundamental departure. You will set your goals and revise them. You will prepare the teachers, students, parents, the community, the school board and the superintendent. You will prepare them by involving them at the planning stage and hopefully you will do all you can to retain their involvement.

You are here because you are interested in better schools through a better program, better use of the school facilities and better use of the school term. You are fortunate to be in education today. The future portends excitement, adventure, challenges and a life which is rewarding.

FIRST GENERAL SESSION

Welcome: Dr. James Gemmell
President
Clarion State College

FIRST GENERAL SESSION

Welcome: Dr. James Gemmell

It is a pleasure to welcome our friends from other states to the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and to extend a warm greeting to all of you here today. Clarion State College is glad to have this opportunity to co-sponsor this important conference, with the Pennsylvania Department of Education. Now I say important advisedly because I think there are several characteristics of this conference that make it an important one. First of all, to be of importance, a conference must focus on a significant issue or problem, and this conference certainly does that. There are a number of aspects of Year Round Education, a number of important questions related to the structure of the school year that need to be studied and examined. Taxpayers, as our friend Governor Broderick knows too well, are asking how can we keep the rising costs of school down? Parents are asking, why do our children have to be out of school so long during the summer months? And educators are asking, how can time be used to the best advantage of the students? Secondly, it seems to be for a seminar to be important, it must come to grips with the problem or issue. And this seminar is designed to do just that. Featured on the program are consultants with various points of view about Year Round Education, and there are people from various walks of life here to look at the problem from different angles. There will be ample opportunity for each of you to interact, and to seek answers to the questions which you have brought with you and I suspect you are likely to get a variety of answers from which to choose. Thirdly, for a seminar to be important it must involve people with ideas, with convictions, with purpose. This seminar abounds in that. I am proud to have with us here today, the chairman of the National Council of Lieutenant Governors. Our own distinguished Lieutenant Governor, Ray Broderick. We are also pleased to have as a part of this seminar, many of the nation's leaders and experimenters in Year Round Education. We are privileged to have with us many school board members, administrators, teachers and parents to participate. Finally, for a seminar to be important, and I think that this is the most important point, it must lead to further action. Because, we can talk all we want to here today, but the seminar will not be much of a success unless somehow it has some effect on what we do after we leave here. At Clarion we hope to do something about it, at least we are going to try. We are in the process of building a Research-Learning Center. When it is completed in 1971, we plan to operate a Research Demonstration Model of a flexible elementary and secondary Year Round School. We think we have some ideas that are sound, at least we hope so. And we want to try them and we think that with the continued support of many concerned citizens including Ray Broderick who encouraged us, we intend to try them. We hope to operate a well organized all year school in which both the time and the curriculum of the student are individualized. And we hope also to demonstrate the flexibility of such a program as geared to meet the changing needs of our society and perhaps suitable as

a structure for schools throughout Pennsylvania and the nation. We have been talking about flexibility and I think you see that the members up here on the dais are certainly flexible. The director of this National Seminar, John McLain is also the director of our Research-Learning Center. Joining him with you in this discussion are several members of the Center staff and of our teacher education division. During the next two days, we'll be talking with you and we hope to gain from you a better understanding of what specific issues are that relate to year-round education, and how some of these issues might be resolved. So again I welcome you to this important conference, The Second National Seminar on Year-Round Education. Thank you very much.

FIRST GENERAL SESSION

Presiding: Donald M. Carroll, Jr.
Assistant Commissioner for
Basic Education
Pennsylvania Department of Education

INTRODUCTION OF LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR BRODERICK

Donald M. Carroll, Jr.

Thank you very much, Dr. Gemmell. Our first speaker this morning is Lieutenant Governor Raymond J. Broderick of Pennsylvania. The Lieutenant Governor was born in Philadelphia; he attended our Lady of Victory Elementary School and graduated from West Catholic High School. He was the valedictorian of his class of the elementary school and the high school. He graduated with honors from Notre Dame in 1935 and the University of Pennsylvania Law School in 1938 where he was editor of the Law Review. Governor Broderick is a veteran of the U.S. Navy, served in the Asiatic, Pacific and European Theatres and left active duty with the rank of Lieutenant Commander in the U.S. Naval Reserves. While in the Navy he met and married his wife, the former Margerie Beecum. Governor Broderick and his wife and five children now live in Philadelphia. Governor Broderick is senior partner in the law firm of Broderick, Shufford, and Fitzpatrick having practiced law in Philadelphia for thirty years. And prior to his election as Lieutenant Governor in 1966, Governor Broderick served as Township Commissioner in Plymouth Township and was chairman of the Philadelphia Republican Policy Committee in 1965 and 66. Among his present duties as Lieutenant Governor, Governor Broderick is chairman of the State Board of Pardons, Chairman of the State Council Civil Defense and President of the Senate of Pennsylvania. He was elected president of the Pennsylvania National Constitution Convention, he's chairman of the Pennsylvania Bi-Centennial Commission and as has been noted was recently elected chairman of the National Lieutenant Governor's Conference. It is my privilege to introduce to you the honorable Raymond J. Broderick, the Lieutenant Governor of Pennsylvania.

FIRST GENERAL SESSION

Address: Honorable Raymond Broderick
Chairman, National Conference of
Lieutenant Governors and
Lieutenant Governor of Pennsylvania

REMARKS OF LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR RAYMOND J. BRODERICK
AT THE NATIONAL SEMINAR ON YEAR ROUND EDUCATION, HELD AT
THE PENN HARRIS HOTEL, HARRISBURG, PENNA.
MONDAY, APRIL 6, 1970

Survival of the Greatest nation - this world has ever known, depends upon competent and informed people. The history of this great Commonwealth is filled with evidence of Pennsylvania's concern for education. Our founder, William Penn, spoke of "commendable learning, which is preferred before wealth."

The strength of our economy depends upon the strength of our schools. If you want to put it in crass, practical language...good education is good business. But, just as good business does not thrive on the highest costs... neither does good education. The best educational system is not the most expensive one.

In Pennsylvania, education is our most important product. This year, 1.4 billion dollars, 56 percent of the State General Fund budget is for education. Our local governments, our federal government, and non-governmental sources are spending additional billions each year to educate young Pennsylvanians. Education is by far the most expensive commodity of government, particularly at the state and local level, but it still continues to be our most rewarding investment.

Our State is not the only government feeling the pressure of the increased cost of education. Demands are being made upon all governments at all levels, (federal, state and local) to provide more money for education. While the pressure of the people for better schools and more productive educational programs intensifies, the taxpayers are balking at paying the ever-increasing tax bills. What used to be the rare phenomenon of the failure of a school loan at the polls has become commonplace. Taxpayers are asking, "Where will it stop?" But fortunately, we all agree that we must never cease our efforts to improve our educational system.

Experts in the field of education predict that the costs will continue to rise. They predict that within 10 years the cost of public education will increase by 70 percent. And this prediction is made despite an expected decline in student population.

The needs are not questioned. We must never stop working to make our educational system better, but we must find a way to get more education out of every tax dollar.

At the National Conference of Lieutenant Governors, of which I am Chairman, we adopted a most important Resolution. It requests an investigation

of the possibility of restructuring the curriculum of primary and secondary schools in order to obtain greater economic efficiency in the operation of our schools and the use of our school facilities without compromising the quality of education. As you know, most children today start school at the age of five in kindergarten. Many of them are now starting at age 4 in pre-kindergarten classes. The thought behind the Lieutenant Governors' Resolution was that by virtue of the advances in our educational system we should be able to prepare students for college or vocational training at an earlier age, thereby effecting substantial savings in the cost of the education process by compressing the period of time for primary and secondary education.

A recent unheralded piece of legislation could be the one small step which can become the giant leap forward toward economy in education in Pennsylvania. I refer to Senate Bill 836, signed into law by Governor Shafer on July 30 last year. Under this bill, the Secretary of Education can now approve school calendars which provide more than the currently mandatory 180 days a year. The Bill also authorizes scheduling students for less than the presently required five and one-half hour school day. This Act opens the door for the "Year-Round School" in Pennsylvania. Flexibility in scheduling will allow for year-round programs which after a period of transition, can provide relief to our spiraling school costs through a more efficient use of classrooms and teachers, relief from the need to build additional schools and a reduction in transportation costs.

The term "Year-Round School" means different things to different people. I use the term to mean "A restructuring of our present school year to provide for year-round education with appropriate curricular reforms. This restructuring plan could take the form of a four-quarter year; a trimester, extended school year; split sessions, or a continuous instruction plan. It would provide varying options for voluntary or mandatory participation by students, teachers, and other school personnel. The important thing is that the year-round school plan developed in any given community must meet local needs and reflect local goals. All plans for the "Year-Round School" should include adequate vacation periods for both teachers and students.

The student benefits in a restructured year-round school could be tremendous. The year-round school would establish dramatic evidence of society's commitment to provide opportunities for children who live in depressed areas. On June 1 of each year (or whenever school is dismissed for the summer) thousands of children are released for three months. Only a small percentage seek or find employment, and few have the opportunity to become involved in an educational experience. Consequently, many of these children are drawn into unwholesome activities because of simple boredom and a lack of something better to do. A year-round school program would help keep these youngsters involved during the summer months, thus reducing juvenile crime and delinquency. Secondary school students who must work to support themselves or to supplement family income may find employment more readily available in an optional attendance plan. This would provide employment opportunities throughout the year, thus relieving the difficult summer teenage employment program. Those students who attend a year-round school would experience a decrease in the amount and rate of loss of learning over the summer vacation period. This would obviously cut down on "reteaching" time in the fall.

In today's society with the emphasis on post graduate education many young people do not enter the economic mainstream until their late twenties or early thirties. (Our oldest son, Pat, graduated from college at 22 and then entered the U.S. Navy, where he signed up as a jet-pilot for five years. He still thinks he would like to be a lawyer. This means three years in Law School. He will be thirty before he puts in his first day in his chosen career.) The educational process can be condensed. Students completing college in three years through advanced standing from high school credits and students starting graduate school before completing four years of college show that it can be done, and done effectively. The year-round school could give students the chance to accelerate their educational programs, move on to college or start to earn their own way much earlier in life.

There are many economic benefits. The "year-round school" would save classroom space. It would make for a more efficient use of school facilities. Buildings would be used year-round making more efficient use of the tax dollar. The same facilities could be used to educate up to one-third more students. There would be economies in construction, in debt service, cost of utilities, book and supply charges and other items.

In addition, theoretically, fewer teachers would be needed since employment would be on a year-round basis. Similarly, teachers employed on a year-round basis would not need to seek temporary summer employment. A year-round system could be of benefit to teachers. It would make them full time professionals. No longer would some of them be forced to moonlight with non-related and less remunerative summer work.

The "Year-Round School" concept is far from unique. Before 1840, such cities as Buffalo, Baltimore, Cincinnati, New York and Chicago, all observed what might be considered a year-round school year totaling as many as 49 weeks, with vacations not necessarily in the farm-work-related summertime. As a matter of fact, the United States is close to holding the dubious distinction of having the world's shortest school year. Most other countries average 25 to 30 days of schooling a year more than Pennsylvania's 180. Austria, Czechoslovakia and Denmark each have school years of 240 days. The same is true in West Germany, Russia and Holland. Our agrarian heritage is the basis for our short-school year. Neither teachers nor students were available during the months of planting, harvesting and cultivating crops, and, quite frankly, formal education was considered less important. The question which we must face today is whether we should continue long hot summers with school doors closed.

The National Education Association has taken the issue by the horns and has come to the conclusion that the 9 months school should be abandoned. They have recommended the inauguration of an active campaign to win acceptance of the concept of the "Year-Round School."

The City of Atlanta has already established a well-planned, ultra-flexible four-quarter, year-round system. New York is working on implementing legislation for an eleven-month school calendar, designed to release space for economy measures by alternating student enrollment. In Hayward, California, the elementary school program has been designed with quarters of 10 weeks

of school and 3 weeks of vacation, which all students must attend. More than 250 other school districts are considering year-round classes at this time.

Obviously, we cannot adopt a "year-round" program and expect all our educational problems to vanish. There are many practical obstacles which must be overcome before any such program can be a success. But perhaps the most devasting problem is the general resistance to change, which will come from some students, some teachers, some parents, some businessmen and some administrators. Resistance can be expected because this represents a break in the accustomed routine of things. However, the wastefulness of this nation's traditional policy of keeping its schools open only 9 months out of 12 should be self-evident.

The promise of the year-round school lies both in the more efficient use of facilities, programs and personnel and in the expectation of more exciting, more penetrating and more meaningful educational experiences. In these times, when school costs are a critical problem, the opportunity to get more for the school dollar cannot be overlooked any longer. Properly administered, the use of our school plant investment for 12 months instead of 9 months out of the year should mean substantial savings of tax dollars. At the same time, it will reduce the overall time required to prepare our children for high school, college, graduate or technical schools...and life. We can no longer afford the luxury of long idle summers during which both schools and children's minds are closed.

Much of the burden of creating this change and giving direction to this change must be assumed by you, the professional educators. I urge you to give your leadership and direction to the possibilities that will be presented here at this National Seminar on Year-Round Education.

FIRST GENERAL SESSION

Address: Andrew Adams
Director of Educational Affairs, VISTA

BASIC DESIGNS FOR YEAR-ROUND EDUCATION

Presented by
Andrew Adams

Thank you, Mr. Carroll. I'm going to be a little low for you to see and, to get even with you all, I think I'm going to make you stand up for an hour and a half to watch me.

For the best historical background of the built up schools, George Glinke from Utica, Michigan, has a mimeographed form on the background of year-round schools. He's done a tremendous job on this one, giving you an historical approach on all of the schools that have tried it way back. So, if you don't have this, he has mimeographed it and will give you a copy.

Well, down to my talk. I sort of thought about basic approaches to, or basic designs in, year-round education. This gets down to a sort of evaluation on what's best and what isn't, but I think a lot of pros are following me who have experimented with these approaches and they'll tell you the pros and cons. I'm not sure what's best. I know you have to finesse your way through when you're moving on the year-round education.

I think of the story in the Navy where the new ensign on board the carrier was given instructions by the captain that he would have to tell Seaman Smith that his mother passed away. They had just received a wire. So the ensign went out and he called for Seaman Smith. He got Seaman Smith and said, "Seaman Smith, your mother just kicked the bucket." The captain found out about this and he was a little shaken up. He said, "Ensign, you have to use a little more finesse. You've got to learn to talk to the men and be easy about things like this. You just can't come right out and say, 'Your mother kicked the bucket.' Use a little finesse." So a few months later he had a second chance. The captain said, "We just heard that O'Callahan's mother passed away. Now this time, ensign, use a little finesse on this one." So the ensign thought a little and he called for all hands on deck and he lined them all up front and said, "Allright now, all those who have living mothers, take one step forward. Just a minute there, O'Callahan."

Well, it's hard to say what's best when we try our basic designs in year-round education. I keep thinking of the story of when the tide had turned in the Civil War and General Grant was going pretty good, but one of the more conservative critics of General Grant got an audience with President Lincoln and told Lincoln that General Grant might be a good general allright, but he really hits the booze. President Lincoln looked at him and said, "Is that right? Find out what brand he uses. I want to send him more."

This is a story in basic designs in year-round schools. What works for you is probably the best. I'll go over some of the considerations for year-round schools and start with the national needs in education. I think you all agree to this but I've listed eight of them. There are probably more. The first one and, of course, this is the song that was sung last night by our good speakers and this morning. And we're going to keep singing it. That is, "Education for all kinds of kids." We're talking about the disadvantaged, the Indians, the blacks, the gifted, the handicapped and disturbed. In other words - individualized instruction. This is a great need in education today. The second is occupational education as well as academic education. I think this is a new consideration. As you know, one of our objectives in education has been the intellectual development. Most of the pros in education have kind of [illegible] from this idea of occupational education because it's in the realm of training, they say. Training is something that maybe you apply to industrial training sections or typing skills or automobile or something, but most of them have graduated from a teacher training institution. But training is a little less pro than the word education but I think we'd better accept this one today.

The Vocational Education Act at its peak is providing up to $2 million a year for vocational education of schools. The President in speaking about the welfare program today says that training and retraining is the answer to our poverty, at least the big answer to the welfare program. The schools are going to be a part of this thing, so now we're a little confused. Is the intellectual now alone or is it occupational education? And, perhaps, one day we must combine the two.

The third need is the need of options. We keep talking about this one. We need options in our curriculum, we need options in our scheduling, we need options all over the place. We've got to give the teacher a chance to use her option. What kids are screaming about all over our country is options. They want to make some decisions in curriculum. We've been saying this long before the progressive education movement. Give the kids options based on interests and motivations. There's a great need today in education to provide options all the way up and down the line. Why are we slow in providing them? Because it makes us feel insecure. It makes you think. If I had to decide every morning whether I was going to brush my teeth or not, I don't know how many times I'd brush them. You see, it's tough to put the burden of choice on everyone, for everything, because they're going to have to think. They're going to have to make a decision. People hate to make decisions. They're afraid of accountability. The fourth is that of the application of the best instructional means to reach this end of quality education, the best instructional systems. This is the great stress today. What are the best instructional techniques, means, systems to accomplish the end? Now, I make a point here that we sometimes look at these instructional means as an end, don't we?

We knock ourselves out to get team teaching and make that an end in itself and even measure it by how well the teachers felt about it and ask questions related to something other than the learning ends. Let us be watchful lest we do this in our designs for our year-round schools.

I write an article in the American School Board Journal in July of 1958 and called it "A sliding four-quarter plan". I wrote that as though it were the best plan in the world, but in fact it is only a means. Sometimes it can be an end to those who get involved in it. The fifth is education in and out of the classroom and the school. This is a tough one. We've got to move education out of those schools. We've been singing this community-school song for a long time but we've been long in achieving this end. We've got to move education out of the classroom and I think year-round schools may help accomplish this.

The sixth one is more educational time. You heard the speakers who were worried about the kids starting their professions at age 40. That is a little old to start your profession. Because of the knowledge explosion, we think we've got some other answers. We are now saying that we shouldn't teach knowledge and facts. We should teach only skills. Not only the skills of the three R's but the skills of inquiry, creative thinking, research techniques, how to brief and how to give reports. It is true that, if you do a good job of teaching the skills, you're going to have to use some footballs to play with skills. In other words, use knowledge and facts. And here we can use the system of options. I guess it really doesn't matter to us today whether we make the wrong choice in the exact facts we teach because facts are changing so fast anyway. So the facts are the knowledge of the footballs that develop the skills. I guess in education we're going to have to hang on to our hats in skills because of the knowledge explosion. Anyhow, we're trying to buy more educational time.

The seventh need requires little discussion. It's more educational money. We need money for people, we need money for things, etc. The President stressed that we need some hard measures of what's best to do the job. We're hung up on this and this is why they pull back in Washington on many of our programs. Stress to find out what is best so we don't waste too much. Well, those are eight needs that I think we can look at across the country and then ask ourselves what designs will accomplish these needs, and again ask ourselves, "Will year-round schools do this?"

Allow me to recount the eight needs of achieving our projected goals. The first is "quantity breeds quality." That is to say, if we're at it long enough, quality will be a byproduct. The second I will call "concepts of principles." The ammunition you require to select the design you want for a year-round school.

We have a lot of designs. I can look through the literature I get in the mail now and come up with a couple dozen designs and I'm

sure one would just about fit your situation. So, we're kind of hung up on how to implement this thing.

The third is more of the same. We must ask ourselves as we talk about year-round schools, "Are we going to provide more of the same thing that we have provided in the nine-month schools? I hope not. I hope you consider this principle as you are designing your plan.. Often we just extend the school and give more of the same.

The fourth is management. The managerial field now is recognized as a professional field in itself, as we know. So, we have to combine these two professions. There is a great need for the union of these two functions. Unfortunately many of our administrators have not had basic management training. Our administrative training at the universities has been pretty much educationally oriented rather than management oriented. Sometimes I think maybe the best way to give considerations for year-round schools is to bring out an expert manager who knows nothing about education. Then he's not too close to it. He can think in terms of how to manage, how to administrate. Here are five functions of management in the profession, as you know. Planning, organizing, staffing, directing and controlling. This is the kind of system we should apply as we consider designs for year-round schools.

The next concept is "educational or economic objectives." Well, obviously it's not either/or. I hope we will think constantly of both, not either/or. Because, if we're talking about the new PPBS for running our budgets and our educational programs, then that kind of system calls for cost effectiveness. In other words, how effective are you in the program per unit? The cost. That's what we're talking about. So if year-round education is to cost more in a total budget, but the cost per unit of instruction and the cost per unit of learning can be shown to be less, then you must think in terms of both, rather than to get wrapped up in this other either/or situation.

Another concept is "student or curriculum programming." I'm just about ready to throw out the word "curriculum". We're so wrapped up in the programs that we're talking about that we don't think of the student. We have said that the determinate of education shall be the student, society, of course the school as an institution, and the fourth one I'd like to add is available resources. But as you know, the most neglected determinates of curriculum have been from the student side, his motivation, his interests, his needs, etc. So I think we got hung up when we called it an instructional program or curriculum. So I'm ready to throw that out and start a whole new terminology - maybe this will help. Sometimes you change the labels, this is the Washington technique. You change the labels and it changes everything. Maybe it will partly work but we must call it the student program. Everytime you talk about the curriculum, you don't mention the word curriculum. You just say, well we'd like to explain the student program in our schools. The student program,

not the curriculum. Why do we need this concept? I think this is what we're trying to get to when we talk about individualized instruction. We have too long tried to fit the student into the existing curriculum or instructional program. Now what we're trying to do is fit the curriculum and instructional program to the student. So let's put the emphasis on the student program, not the instructional program. The student's learning program.

The next concept is "Who said so?" I keep wondering who this character was that ran around and kept saying 30 kids in the classroom. Boy, he really did it. He ran all around the country and said 30 kids in the classroom. That's it. So, what do we do? We build schools all over the country with 30 in the classroom. Nobody ever said, "Is this an ideal number to teach?" Well, it's a lousy number. It's too many for small group instruction and certainly not economical for large group instruction. Who was this guy? Thirty. "Who said so?" And there are other things of "Who said so?" Who said learning should start in September and end in June? Who said courses should all be taught one period a day for five days a week? Who said school should start at 9:00 a.m. and close at 3:30 p.m. You keep asking these questions but I think this concept of who said so is a good one to be considered because all the enemies of the year-round schools are going to say these things. So the best way to answer them, maybe, is to say "Who said so?"

Everything is designed as one or two years of this and that. To get into college, you need one year of language or you need two years of something else. Everything is built on this tight rigid structure of thinking. If you ask somebody how well they can speak a language, they don't say, "Well, I can get along, I can speak this, I can communicate with a native from that country." They don't answer you that way. They say, "I had one year of Spanish." What does that mean, one year of Spanish?

Another concept is "same teachers for same students." This is another one we get hung up on when we consider year-round designs. It doesn't have to be that way. You don't need the same teachers for the same kids. It doesn't mean that the teacher has to stick right with them. I think there are many ways to skin this cat. I think what works in your place may not work here and I'm not saying that maybe even in your place you couldn't get two or three different kinds implemented and maybe all of them could be an equally potential success.

Another concept is that of the vertical and horizontal. If we must stress the vertical to meet the educational needs, we've got to think of the horizontal and that's our justification for considering the year-round school. So we won't just talk K-12, we'll talk articulation, articulation horizontally, that's what it's all about. We've been pounding for articulation up and down trying to not have that gap between elementary and secondary, so now what we're doing is pounding the horizontal articulation.

What about the integration plan? We can't use a problem solving technique but I guess we've got to remember this integration thing. Maybe this is one way not to have this early principle more of the same. You've got to develop programs that will integrate the subject fields.

All evaluations for new programs, what's this principle? This is what has knocked a lot of good innovations out. I don't know how many team teaching programs I've noted that have evaluated a team teaching on old instruments. The old achievement test. Be sure from a good management standpoint that when you build a design for year-round school it will be new, of course, so make your evaluation new. In other words, if you use old evaluation methods, you will have tremendous Las Vegas odds against you. Those instruments are made for schools of today, not tomorrow.

Curricular and extra-curricular---I thought we accepted at one time that all learning directly or indirectly influenced by the school will be called the school curriculum. We still are talking even at this conference about how we can have some extra-curricular activities. This bothers me. It gets into this other one about occupational, and intellectual development. This extra-curricular idea is still hung up on what is the bonafide curriculum. It is, I guess, the three hours in science and social studies. And the extra-curricular are the things we try to throw in. I keep hoping we accept these concepts that I have talked about.

Down the middle, education is still a problem. The arguments for year-round education are to get the disadvantaged, the gifted. The objectives of the regular school and summer school are different. This is a shame, isn't it? In other words, you develop an extended year of summer school and what do you come up with? You come up with "Now we're going to teach the kids some creative thinking, now we're going to teach them inquiry, we're going to let them do some art, we're going to have the remedial kids work on the basic skills. We're going to have some programs for the accelerated kids. What the hell have they been doing all year? What have they been doing all year if they're going to do this only in summer session? It shakes me.

I'd like to throw in one more idea that I have. I've been saying around the country that the director of student placement or student programming is one of the most important characters in the school district. I don't like to see him as director of pupil personnel on the staff who takes attendance and reports into the state on the ADA or something like that. To concentrate on the student program, then, the director of student placement is the most responsible guy in that school. He's the guy who's got to use computers and the instruments to make sure the right kids are in the right place at the right time. I'd pay him almost as much as the superintendent, the director or the assistant superintendent for student placement. He's my big man in the year-round schools of the future.

You're going to hear stories during this conference. You'll hear the quarter plans, the semester plans, the continuous plans and the summer school plans. These, of course, are basic. You will also hear all kinds of combinations. Multiple trails in New York would be the 12-4, the 45-50, you're going to hear several kinds, but the basic are to have some sort of a quarter arrangement or some sort of semester, trimester, quadri-semester, and for a continuous year without these quarters and semesters or attached summer school.

I am thinking of still another plan. I don't think you'll pick this up in your reading. It's what I call the "accidental cooperative programs." These are the plans that have come out of the poverty programs, Title I and recreational programs that have been pouring out all over the country working with the schools. The accidental cooperative ones. Don't let these go. See what's going on in your community. You'll find recreational programs and Title I, Head-Start, all kinds, they're going all year around. They're probably the most successful. The only thing is we don't call them year around, but we should to get hold of them, to make the school a part of them.

And this brings me to one of the most important stresses I want to make and that is that I've been sitting here talking about year-round schools. I don't like the stamp of identity. I think this is a trap just like the term "curriculum" is a trap in the instructional program. I think year-round schools is a horrible trap because we've got to think of year-round education. It's kind of more of the same kind of thing. If we're going to get that thing called occupational development and training, we have to get Ford Company to help us to develop the mechanics, we have to get IBM, we have to get all these companies. If we're talking about running school all year around, we have to get the recreation department with us and everyone. Let's from now on never mention the word year-round schools. Say instead, "year-round education program."

What factors have we considered? We've talked about the economic factors. We've talked about learning provisions. We've talked about student oriented factors, teacher-oriented, community-oriented and various other groups. We want to increase the instructional time, we want to have fewer students in school at one time, we want to concentrate on special groups - disadvantaged groups, college bound, etc. We want to get the kids off the streets, flexible instructional program, save on teachers, give students more time in school, save on facilities, provide more courses in the curriculum, get kids in the labor market faster and into college faster, pay teachers more, give teachers more prep time, more training time, give teachers a better choice of vacation so they can go to the Bahamas, more study time for kids, more school recreation. Do you want to just show the public that you are using school buildings all year? Or do you want to show the public you're improving education? Do you want to show the public

that you're making teachers work all year? Or do you want to get the public involved? What I'm saying is - they go with the factors, will weather conditions permit? Do you have air conditioning? Effective school maintenance, school transportation, labor season, sports and state laws. So these are factors that you must consider while considering the plans you want.

One way to do this, and I've tried it, is to use a matrix, use two dimensions. One dimension - put down the various plans, quarter plans, semester plans and continuous year; and the other - put down the factors you want to kill like make teachers work more, keep kids in school longer, get them off the streets, and just check them off on the matrix. Which plan answers most of these things is what you want for your school.

We've gone through a period where we have been talking about getting the community involved, get community action, self identity, self motivation, etc. etc. These have been our big programs, our social programs. Now Washington is moving into the hard tones of the hit parade. In other words, they want safe streets, good schools - the hard stuff, good health, good homes, the same as reading, writing and arithmetic. That's what Washington's doing now. We want the basic stuff so it's kind of a pull back and I'm sure if we get all wrapped in this we'll get back to the people who oriented the softer kind of stuff, the psychological. So we move back and forth. We're in this phase. Why is it good? Because it makes a success of what we've been doing. We must find out what's good and what's bad. When we do, then we can get back to development and the work of quality education.

FIRST GENERAL SESSION

Address: George Jensen
Chairman
National School Calendar Study Committee

"MAJOR DEVELOPMENTS ACROSS THE NATION IN YEAR-ROUND EDUCATION"

by

George M. Jensen

Years ago when I was in business I used to be a sort of "go-go" guy... impatient of delays, exasperated by those who didn't get the message, always rarin' to "get with it" and get the job done. But since I've become deeply interested and involved in the year-round operation of our schools I've found that in education things aren't done that way, especially when it comes to making any changes. The respect for tradition and the status quo is positively overwhelming!

Thus, when I consider that changes within the educational structure materialize with such agonizing slowness, I guess I should be happy that over the recent past there actually have been some major developments in the area of our mutual concern; this in spite of the fact that the "idea" of "year-round education" has been in the educational hopper only a little over 50 years! By educational timetables I guess this is hardly long enough to get the wrappings off the package.

I'm reminded that in my own home town of Minneapolis, Minnesota a former superintendent of our schools, F. B. Jackson, made a year-round school proposal in November of 1918 and it was eventually sunk without a trace--not because it didn't make sense then as it does now, but because it was talked to death--it involved change. And, I should add, the Minneapolis Board of Education hasn't done anything about it yet!

Be all this as it may, there <u>is</u> progress to report, and I will cover it under the following headings:

1. Developments within the professional associations such as N.E.A., A.A.S.A. and other influential educational organizations.

2. Developments within the various State Departments of Education.

3. Developments in various school systems, both large and small.

4. Production of pertinent literature, including studies, bibliographies, reports, etc.

5. Year-round education as news in the media and as story material in national publications.

6. Developments within the school board structure.

7. Signs of public reaction to the overall idea of year-round education.

8. Some general conclusions on the "State of the Art."

I believe the foregoing 8 items just about cover the waterfront, so let me expand upon them.

Item #1, developments within the professional associations. Over the past year or two there has been more activity in N.E.A. related to this subject than at any previous time. This has involved production of a Research Summary, "The Rescheduled School Year," the establishment of a special committee on year-round school, and the release of a number of news items dealing with year-round school.

The Association is being very cautious, overly so in my opinion, in its approach to the subject, but nevertheless it <u>is</u> taking note of the growing interest in all year education.

At its Representative Assembly meeting in Dallas, Texas in June of 1968 it was decided to activate a special committee to study year-round school and render a report and recommendations to the next annual meeting of the Assembly in Philadelphia in 1969. It is interesting to note that this committee was composed of a cross section of classroom teachers, school administrators, school board members and parents.

After its deliberations this group submitted its report, including a summary and 6 recommendations. Time will not permit delineating the recommendations in detail, but they urged that N.E.A. actively support the concept of restructuring the school year and that it stimulate the exploration, innovation and experimentation of the program on the part of its local affiliates. Here is a verbatim quote of the last sentence of the summary: "The Committee submits the proposition that the proper implementation of this concept is not only compatible with our national goals and democratic principles, but will, in fact, greatly expedite their attainment."

In my opinion this was a good, constructive report, and its adoption and implementation would have been a star in N.E.A.'s crown. However, in Philadelphia at the 1969 meeting of the Representative Assembly the report was rejected. It is interesting to note that for some strange reason the writers and sponsors of the report were given no opportunity either to present it properly or to defend it in debate. Its rejection was engineered by a certain few of the members who remain totally resistant to change.

As a matter of fact when I requested a number of copies of this fine report for distribution to interested individuals Glen Robinson, Director of the Research Division of N.E.A. told me that its rejection by the Representative Assembly precluded the possibility of its being available for further use. Nevertheless I have copies and anyone who wishes may have one for the asking.

A.A.S.A. (American Association of School Administrators) in 1960 issued a negatively slanted 26-page booklet entitled "Year-round School." Just last month it released, with appropriate publicity, a new study with a much more positive and forward-looking format. Just a few short years ago, in 1966 to be exact, Dr. Forrest Conner, A.A.S.A. executive secretary, in referring to a year-round school plan, was quoted in a news story in the Houston, Texas Post as saying, "This type of plan should never be considered unless the superintendent is given a lifetime, irrevocable contract with all the powers of a Marine Corps drill sergeant." Furthermore, "Don't try to sell this idea (year-round school) on the grounds that it will save money. You'll end up eating your words and you may have to leave town, too!" Now, after further contemplation and observing certain straws in the educational wind, he states, in commenting upon the newly released study, "With the changing fabric of American society we must find ways to improve education. The extended school year appears to harbor a promising hope."

Those of us interested in seeing education throw off the shackles of tradition and up-date its pattern of school attendance really welcome this changing attitude on the part of our school administrators. Those of you who have followed the "opinion polls" on year-round school in the publication THE NATION'S SCHOOLS have noted the slowly changing attitudes of school superintendents the nation over as reflected by these samplings of the administrative stance on year-round school. Fifteen years ago less than 10 percent of those responding to the Poll favored any type of year-round school approach. Last year's Poll showed nearly 33 1/3 percent generally favoring the idea with most of the rest indicating their opinion that year-round school is on the march and inevitable.

As far as the Council of Chief State School Officers is concerned, several years ago Dr. Edgar Fuller, then executive secretary, but not speaking officially for the Council, expressed himself in an article in THE ROTARIAN magazine for June, 1964, to the effect that certain year-round school plans "could easily be devastating to educational effectiveness" and "This objection (the possible disruption of family vacations) is not as important as the fact that it short-changes pupils and is educationally stultifying for teachers, the school system and the community." I recall with some amusement a conference I once had with Dr. Fuller in his office in Washington.

We were discussing various ramifications of year-round school and I handed him a copy of the University of Toledo publication THE FLEXIBLE SYSTEM (of year-round school organization) by Dr. W. Scott Bauman. He glanced at it then tossed it to one side in a rather disdainful fashion with the comment "Never heard of him." Well, Dr. Fuller has now retired and I understand his replacement, Dr. Don Dafoe, is a younger and perhaps more malleable individual. For the purpose of this report, I tried to contact him to learn if the Council has taken any official position on this matter. I was advised that it had not but that a number of chief state school officers had made their individual positions clear. A number of these educators favor a re-structuring of our school calendar. Time permits only a few quotes. Dr. Jack Nix, Georgia's Superintendent of Schools: "The 4-quarter plan (of year-round

school) offers great possibilities for us to really revolutionize the traditional way of operating our schools." Floyd T. Christian, Florida's Commissioner of Education: "I think it is educationally sound and the thinking people of this state want it and they are asking for it." Dr. Ray Page, State Superintendent of Public Instruction for Illinois has on a number of occasions expressed himself as favoring this proposal and he has helped several school districts in their plans to implement programs, notably Valley View District #96 and its 45-15 plan that you'll hear all about later in this program.

From what I can observe and from what I've just said, it would seem apparent that many of education's professional leaders are looking with greater favor on this proposal than has previously been the case. I, for one, salute these proponents of change.

Item #2, developments within the various State Departments of Education, has just been touched upon in quoting several state superintendents. However, I'd like to elaborate on this a bit first by mentioning several state departments that have been active and then detailing for you some specifics of one such department, Florida.

One of the first state departments to really roll up its sleeves and try to get something done was New York. As a result of the Diefendorf Committee's work and the resulting legislation in 1962 there has been a constant activity in the department, spearheaded by Dr. George I. Thomas who is one of the planners of this seminar and an active participant as well. Under his guidance and prodding a good deal of experimental work along lines of original thinking has taken place. I'll refer to this a little later. You will want to watch what happens in New York State.

Within the last several years both Illinois and Ohio have passed enabling legislation of sorts and the Illinois Department has availed itself of the latitude so granted, but I'm unaware of much activity in the Ohio Department.

The Departments of Georgia and Michigan have made some strides in the right direction--Michigan being the first state to our knowledge to make a relatively substantial grant ($100,000) available to local districts to underwrite some research. This grant was divided among 8 districts after a state-wide competition among some 40 or so districts. The results will, hopefully, be available to interested parties shortly after July 1 of this year.

Both the New Jersey and Maryland Departments are engaged in research at this time, as are Colorado and Pennsylvania. The Colorado Department, in cooperation with Educational Services Institute of Cincinnati, just conducted what was titled "The Executive Seminar on the Extended School Year." Some 15 states and the Dominion of Canada were represented among some 125 attendees. It is reported to have been a very successful session. Kentucky has also done some investigation, as have several other states.

I'm going to spotlight Florida for a moment as it has been doing some things which should prove to be the forerunners of real progress.

In the first place, the superintendent has adopted a positive position in favor of change. This helps immeasurably. Back in 1947 Florida passed the Minimum Foundation Law which reorganized the state's public school system and made possible the beginnings of a summer enrichment program. In 1957 the Department made a study of a year-round 4-quarter plan and shelved it.

In 1962 the Governor's Commission on Quality Education in its recommendation #20 revived the idea. In 1963 Florida proved its willingness to experiment through the Nova High School extended school year program. In 1964 the University School of Florida State University at Tallahassee began a trimester operation. This was abandoned in 1966.

In 1965 the Florida Educational Research and Development Council conducted a feasibility study of year-round school for Polk County. The findings were not favorable to a full-fledged 4-quarter year-round operation.

In 1967 the Governor's Commission on Quality Education through its recommendations #27 and #52 again revived the idea. In May of 1969 the Bureau of Curriculum and Instruction, Department of Education, held a 2-day statewide conference spearheaded by a very positive charge from the superintendent and supported by the presence of nationally recognized experts serving as consultants.

At this same time the Legislature passed two bills pertinent to the problem, House Bill #8 which authorized county boards to institute a 12-month school year of 4 equal quarters and Senate Bill 541 directing the State Department of Education to make a study of the extended and 12-month school year, reporting its findings to the 1970 Legislature.

Subsequent to this the Dade County Board of Public Instruction authorized its Division of Educational Planning and Services to explore and recommend alternate plans for the most efficient use of school plants. A final report is yet to be issued. Late in 1969, in an attempt to help interested districts, the Bureau of Research, Department of Education, prepared an annotated bibliography. I've seen it and it's a good one as it isn't cluttered with a lot of non-pertinent material written prior to 1950. It is prepared in self-mailer form, 28 pages, and may be secured from the Bureau of Research, Department of Education, Tallahassee, Florida, 32304.

In January of this year the Bureau of Planning and Coordination made a survey of the interest in rescheduling the school year. Among the 67 county systems in Florida, 13 were interested. In February of 1970 the Department of Education finally got around to implementing the directive of Senate Bill 541 passed the previous May.

The recommendations of this committee had not, as of the time this was prepared, March 4, made its report to the Legislature.

Four recommendations have been determined, however, and they leave much to be desired on the part of those who favor a real up-dating of our obsolete school attendance pattern. They reflect very clearly the widely held administrative bias against such revision and clearly lean toward a beefed up summer school program. Almost lost among the recommendations is that dealing with a pilot project on a modified 4-quarter plan involving phased attendance.

I have employed this considerable detail on Florida to show how slow and agonizing is the path to change. In spite of the positive attitude of the superintendent, many department heads and staff people are dragging their feet in Florida as everywhere. Many district superintendents also are bucking progress toward this change and seem to share the opinion of Dr. Ray Shelton, boss of the Hillsborough County (Tampa) system, who recently blamed Legislative pressure for the State Department interest in year-round school. Regardless of this resistance, however, it would seem from the latest press reports that from 3 to 5 county systems in Florida will embark, with state department aid, on some type of pilot program involving year-round operation.

Item 3, developments in various school systems, can be covered here in little time as most of these innovative procedures have a place on our program. I refer to Fulton County, Georgia and Atlanta; Lockport, Illinois; Northville, Michigan; St. Charles, Missouri; Grand Forks, North Dakota, and others.

An interesting situation is shaping up in Cincinnati, Ohio where school superintendent Dr. Paul Miller is guiding the development of a year-round plan for his system. Several years ago I talked with Dr. Miller when he was in charge of the Syracuse, New York schools. After some discussion on the pros and cons of the year-round school concept as it existed in 1962 he said, and I quote, "I'm not sold 100 per cent but keep pushing me, I'm leaning in the right direction!"

Cincinnati set up a study committee in November of 1968 and its work has culminated in a series of recent meetings of staff people and the citizenry under the sponsorship of the Cincinnati School Foundation. Dr. John Letson, superintendent of Atlanta schools, spoke enthusiastically at the large meeting held on March 4. "Our plan is working fantastically," he told questioners who flocked around him at the conclusion of a two hour session. This is one program to keep an eye on.

Another you might watch with some care is the Jefferson County, Kentucky system, the bedroom county of Louisville, under Dr. Richard VanHoose. They have been working diligently on their program for over 2 years. They have brought all interested segments of the community into their discussions--the churches, the PTA, the youth service organizations, the Chamber of Commerce and others.

In September, 1969, they sponsored a large conference on the subject to which were invited state department of education representatives, legislative representatives, state athletic league people, and all those groups in the

community I just mentioned. Brought in to assist were several nationally recognized experts in the area of year-round school thinking.

Dr. VanHoose has been diligent in his efforts to promote change without seriously offending any important segment of the community structure. How do things stand as of today? A detailed news story in the Louisville Courier-Journal datelined February 9, 1970 stated, "Jefferson County School officials announced yesterday that they favor replacing the traditional 9-month school calendar with a new 4-quarter, year-round schedule." The Citizens Advisory Committee also unanimously endorsed the superintendent's recommendation. The School Board chairman, Mrs. Roberta Tully, a member of this committee, enthusiastically endorsed the proposal. Formal board action is yet to be taken, but keep your eye on Jefferson County as it would seem they are really serious about throwing off the straight jacket of tradition and bringing their system into the 20th century.

Item #4. A good deal of literature has been produced during the past year or two. Much of it is simply a rehash of what has gone before--dealing with what happened in Bluffton, Indiana in 1904, Newark, New Jersey in 1915, and a number of other earlier experiments and trials. Most of this material is not pertinent in today's world and serves very little purpose.

Several publications do merit special attention. Two of them are bibliographies. I've mentioned one already, the one prepared by the Florida State Department of Education. The other is the work of George B. Glinke, Utica Community Schools, Utica, Michigan. It is unannotated but probably the most complete yet put together.

Among other noteworthy writings of recent vintage are Dr. John McLain's two booklets, THE FLEXIBLE ALL-YEAR SCHOOL and CONSIDERATIONS FOR ECONOMY AND QUALITY EDUCATION THROUGH YEAR-ROUND SCHOOLS. Both are available at this conference.

Another publication of interest is STRETCHING THE SCHOOL SALARY DOLLAR, a report of the deliberations of the Education Committee of the Citizens League, 84 South 6th Street, Minneapolis, Minnesota, 55402.

Another and probably the most useful and significant publication to date is Dr. George I. Thomas' THE IMPACT OF A RESCHEDULED SCHOOL YEAR, a report prepared for the legislature of the State of New York by the State Education Department. You will hear from Dr. Thomas this afternoon and I suggest you see him to get your name on the department's list to receive this very well written and important 158-page report.

Item #5, year-round school in the daily press and national magazines. As to the newspapers, our volume of clippings from the nation's press referring to the subject of year-round school continues to rise as public interest increases and more and more school districts begin to consider restructuring their school calendars. The Christian Science Monitor is currently engaged in developing and printing pertinent stories. The latest

syndicated story on year-round school carries the by-line of Dr. Leslie J. Nason, University of Southern California, AP news feature writer--the headline "Education--Use Facilities Year-round."

The public interest and discourse has encouraged magazine editors to take notice, also. As most of you are aware, articles have appeared in the Saturday Review, Reader's Digest, Parents Magazine and others. The April issue of Redbook carries a good report, "The Case for Year-round Schools." Reprints are available. The June, 1970, issue of Better Homes and Gardens will carry a most interesting editorial type article, "We Need Year-round Education--Now." Reprints will be available from Better Homes and Gardens.

Numerous television and radio stations are now recognizing the timeliness of this subject. The NBC Today Show of December 1 devoted a portion of the program to year-round school. A number of the active proponents of year-round school have appeared in television talk shows all over the country. Sixteen millimeter black and white prints of two of these shows are available for free screening by any interested groups. They are available through the National School Calendar Study Committee.

Item #6, school board activity, especially in the organized bodies. It is indeed regrettable that this portion of my report must be so brief. While some individual school board members, both past and present, have been active in encouraging public debate and action in this field, both the state and national school board associations have been remarkably free of official interest.

While it is a fact that AMERICAN SCHOOL BOARD JOURNAL has in 1968 and 1969 carried year-round school stories, one in each of these two years, it is also true that administrative and staff people in these associations, and they are the people who really run them, have been notably cool to the idea. Most of these administrative and staff people have been recruited from the ranks of education. Is it possible that many of them have brought to their school board association responsibilities their old educational prejudice against change? It has always been my idea that a school board should identify as its chief interests matters of policy, and leave the housekeeping to the superintendent and his staff to conduct a professional administration. It seems to me that the school calendar and its basic structuring is a very definite matter of policy and in today's world a matter of <u>urgent</u> policy. I wonder why it is, then, that the school board associations are so loathe to give real help to their members in this area?

It seems possible that a change in this attitude, at least as far as the National Association is concerned, may be in the making.

N.A.S.B. headquarters recently engaged the services of a nationally known accounting firm, Peat, Marwick, Mitchell, Inc., to make an indepth study on year-round school, presumably for the benefit of the officers and board of directors. This could be a step in the right direction. In a letter last

September A. A. Heckman, Executive Director of the Hill Family Foundation, told me that he had had several in person and telephone conversations with Dr. Harold Webb, N.A.S.B.'s chief of staff, on the subject of year-round school. Heckman stated that in his opinion the Association could very well, and I quote, "be of great help by presenting facts, conducting informational-instructional conferences and seminars for School Board members and in conducting operational research were needed to answer the questions of the open minded, to combat the prejudices of those with vested interests and allay the fears of the uninformed." He closed by saying, "It has the capacity to reach a vast majority of our School Boards with facts if it has the will to do so. Now there seems to be the will." Perhaps this will be demonstrated at the N.A.S.B. 1970 meeting next week in San Francisco.

Item #7, signs of public and lay reaction to the general idea of year-round school.

Perhaps the first real sign of informed public and lay support for year-round school was manifested back in 1955 at the White House Conference on Education. One of the recommendations to come to the two table level was, and I quote from the report, "Item #3...A study should be made of the 12-month school year." This recommendation eventually got lost in the educational shuffle in Washington.

In the 15 years since the Conference the matter has come up with increasing frequency as is proved by press and magazine coverage. One illuminating case is that of the public reaction to a television talk show which originated over WLWD Channel 4 of Dayton, Ohio, on January 12 of this year. A representative of our Committee was on the Phil Donahue Show where the entire hour was devoted to an explanation of the general implications of year-round school. Both the listening and studio audiences were privileged to quiz our representative. The interesting thing is that ever since the show we have continued to get letters and calls from the listening public indicating overwhelming approval of the basic proposal. The box score to date, 371 letters of approval, 3 letters of a negative nature, one of which was downright indignant...."Mr. Jensen, you're out of your mind," and, "you certainly have taken leave of your senses!"

Several of the consultants at this conference have had similar experiences on television in tapping public opinion through first explaining the proposition then answering questions. They will tell you that of late informed public opinion is slowly crystalizing in favor of this area of educational innovation.

Item #8. Now for a brief look at the State of the Art, so to speak.

We know that professional, lay and general public interest is increasing and minds are being changed.

We know that conferences such as this are instrumental in advancing acceptance of the idea through converting doubters and firing the enthusiasm of believers.

We know that at long last some real constructive educational and lay thinking is being directed at this problem area.

We know that one of our problems has been that of looking backward to what has been done before regardless of the fact that what has been done before in this area was done under an entirely different set of circumstances in an educational atmosphere that is not at all relevant to conditions as they exist today. We have not seemed willing to trust ourselves and our own judgments.

We know (I hope!) that now is the time to break our lock-step with the past. Not too long ago our keynote speaker of last evening, Dr. Charles H. Boehm, in a national magazine article on education said, "We are the prisoners of a horse and buggy educational program. In industry we use every possible innovation to improve our efficiency. In education we suspect all but the old ways."

To this may I say Amen with the fervent hope that we, both in and out of education, can muster the intestinal fortitude to get on with the job of junking our anachronistic pattern of school attendance in favor of a school calendar that is in tune with the times.

FIRST GENERAL SESSION

Address: Kenneth Hermansen
Superintendent
Valley View Schools
Lockport, Illinois

DESIGNING A YEAR-ROUND PROGRAM TO MEET LOCAL NEEDS

by
Kenneth Hermansen

Thank you. I hope none of you are going to be looking at your watches because you see I left my watch on Illinois time. And I have a quarter to eleven. So I thank all of those previous speakers for allowing me all of this time. I have an hour and fifteen minutes. But I see my task this morning is quite different than the speakers who have preceded me; and perhaps of what you will later hear in the conference. Mine is not the task to thrill you with the history and research and all the verbage of those who are curious about the topic. Mine is to bore you with the nitty gritty of the implementation, the panic periods, while you sleep, while you shake. Because we go on next June. We are just two months away. So if you will bear with me, I will give you some of the problems that come with actual implementation, not with research and design. We started out two years ago and I think I have to admit this from the beginning that I had an advantage that most educators don't have. I think that it is rather typical in the country that every once in a while a superintendent has to reach back and kind of drag his Board along. And I've had the advantage for seventeen years in this community where I have to dotrot sometimes to keep up with my Board. There are times when I wish they were a little more passive and a little more conservative. But I would like to set a little parameter of what I am going to say in the next few minutes so you will get an idea of the context of which I speak; because much of what I may say may sound a little self-centered or it may sound a little selfish. But the thing that I can't make too clear to you is the program that we have, I am not here to sell it to you. I don't care if anybody in the country ever uses it. It was a program that was born out of necessity. And to prove this necessity, ten years ago we had five one room country schools and 89 students scattered among them. Our school district was the fourth wealthiest school district in the state of Illinois. We didn't have a problem in the world. Today we have 5500 students and in the State of Illinois there are 648 common elementary districts. Where ten years ago we ranked fourth in terms of wealth, we now rank 418. So you can see what happened to us. We have a sea of bedrooms where the corn fields used to be. We grow at the rate of over 1000 students a year. We've never had kindergarten before in our districts. It's not that we don't want kindergarten, or we don't appreciate it, or that we don't think it is valuable. We've never had the time or the space to implement it. But our state legislature in their wisdom, saw fit to pass a law making it mandatory so next year we are going to see 26 sessions of kindergarten that we've never seen before. Twelve hundred of them, plus our usual 1000 student growth, so we know that we'll fire up in June with over 2000 more students than we let out on June 5. So, and I tell you these things to impress upon you that our's was a matter of necessity. We had no choice. Our community in the last ten years has passed 15 educational tax rate increases on themselves. And I know for a fact that there is not a community in the state of Illinois that can

match that record. I would suspect that clear out in the Midwest there is not a community that can match that record. So it isn't that our local community has not put forth maximum effort to solve the problem. They have. But what has happened is that we are at our legal limits. We can't go back and ask them to raise their taxes anymore. We have a law in our state and I presume that there is something similar across the country, in the various states that when you go so far, that is it; you can't mortgage any more money. So with this kind of growth, and as I say in ten years we've gone from 89 to over 5500 and next year over 7000. They tell us that in five years, the demographic experts out at the University of Chicago and Northwestern, that we will have 20,000 elementary students. We may well be, in three years the only district in the world who is on year round double session. And I say that seriously, we see this as only solving our problem for perhaps 18 months to three years depending on whether the interest rate on mortgages comes down or not. If it comes down, we are dead. So this gives you an idea of the impact, the importance, the background of why we are going to year roundedness. I will be frank to admit, that had we not had these kinds of problems, I would be quietly sitting in my chair in my office today, not worrying about Year-Round School. I wouldn't be an advocate of it and I wouldn't be preaching it. But necessity forced it and here I am. And getting to the nitty gritty of the situation, it's amazing the things that you don't realize can come up. And let me qualify one sentence more, that what I speak of, as I have said was for our problems, in our community. We are a local elementary district starting in June, K through 8. We have been of course 1 through 8. I know there is merit in application in the secondary level. I haven't had the time to study and research it. I doubt whether you could get the degree of utilization at the secondary level that you can get at the elementary. And I say this very, very generally because as I have admitted I haven't researched it. And I think you are all seasoned enough people, and you have enough background in Year Roundedness. One is to improve and to indeed increase the quality and quantity of education. This costs more money. There is no doubt about it and if we had the money, or if we could find some way to find the money, this would be our goal. But being at our legal limits, we can't raise more money. Our goal is utilization, pure and simple and I'll admit it. Much of what I say might not be too welcomed by pure educationalists. I don't know. But we had a need of being boxed in the corner. We had to get better utilization. At the present time we had 180 classrooms in session, I hope, this morning. Schools out June 5. We fire up again June 30. We will fire up June 30 with the equivalency of 240 classrooms. The design of the year-roundedness for us in terms of utilization is to increase capacity. So today we are operating with 180 classrooms. June 30 we will go with the equivalency of 240 classrooms. Now I think that it was mentioned earlier this morning; I think it was George. Don't look at year-roundedness in terms of saving money. I've spent two years on this now and I've found nowhere you save current money. There are a few places where you can defer future educational expenses. But that is like the woman who goes and buys three hats when she doesn't need them because they were on sale. She saved money. All the savings I am talking about are deferred savings, not savings in your current operating budget. Now, the sixty additional classrooms in our district, if we were to pass bond issue and go out and build them, counting bonded indebtedness, is somewhere in the neighborhood of 6 million dollars. Now that is 6 million dollars we are not asking our tax payers to burden themselves with. We are not saving them with 6 million they are already paying. So I think that it is very important from

the very beginning that if you go into it with the idea that you are going to save money. Now I don't think it has to cost more money. Really, I don't think any new format, any new structure, any new cycling, any new calendar, any new scheduling of necessity has to cost more money. We know what costs more money. It's that clown you spoke of who walked around the country talking about thirty students. To give you an idea of my age, I remember the guy who walked around preaching 25. But we look at it this way. Every time thirty new students move in the district it is just another teacher on the payroll. And that is what increases the cost of education, for us at least. So we went into this, and we sat down and we looked at the alternatives. We can't go to 60 or 70 students in a room. The rooms won't physically hold it. No teacher will teach it. We could go on double session. We have been encouraged to double session over the last ten years, mainly because as is typical, contractors don't get buildings done in time. And we would double session until the building was done. So we've had enough experience of the first things that are cut. They are art and music, PE and extra curricular, and hot lunch and these kind of things. So it was a mandate from our board and our community, salvage the current program and do a job with all of the children. So we sat down and we thought what are the secret cows. And there are only two sacred cows that we honored, mainly because of time. It isn't that I wouldn't want to even challenge them. One is that we can't have school on Saturday and Sunday. So we didn't tackle that one. The other one is that it would be horrible for a first grader to have four teachers in the same year. It would be a very traumatic experience. That's the one I would like to challenge and I will sometime in the near future as we get on the road with this. But those are the only two things that we took as basic fact and didn't try to change, warp or alter. Everything else we sat down and just brainstormed. There were some comments this morning by the Lieutenant Governor on the legislative problems. One member of our team, in Springfield, he's there more than he is in the district, he works as liaison between the state office of education, the education committee of the State Legislature and the School of Problems Commission which is appointed by the Governor of our state to assess and review the problems of education each year and make recommendations to him and the legislature. And this man did a yomen task for us. The nitty gritty you come up with in terms of legislation. For example, starting in June 30 we are going to have 22 different kinds of contractual offerings for teachers. And before I forget to say it, I think there are probably more flexibility for teachers in year-roundedness, than there are for teachers and students. Odd as it may be, we have teachers who have signed contracts, who are going to take three extra weeks at Christmas and go to the Bahamas. We have teachers who have arranged contracts so they can take a winter quarter and go to the University of Miami to further their graduate work. There is all kinds of flexibility for teachers. We ran into the legislative problem in our state that fiscal lines are sacred. Boy, from July 1 to June 30 don't transend it or you'll goof up all the work in the State. And we have spent a lot of time with the state legislature and we finally got around this. And we found out that our approach was, and I would recommend it to all of you, if you are seriously considreing any form of year-roundedness and you have to deal with the state legislature, push for the type of legislation that gives permissiveness and flexibility. In Illinois, the legislation is reading that the state superintendent of public instruction has discretionary powers for a three-year experimental module project on year-roundedness which in no way describes

what we are doing but it does cover us as far as the law is concerned. You find out that state pension boards, for example, worry about the pension, worry about tenure and years of service. They will want a law changed just that quick that will effect 5000 teachers without some experience in application by which they can make better judgment. So if you can get the kind of open ended legislation that gives the state commissioner discretionary powers, this is the kind that I would recommend. And then at the end of three years, or two years, or five years or as long as you can get it drawn out, they have more basis of fact of operation with which to make more intelligent decisions. I want to talk a little bit about the nitty gritty of staff. In the beginning we have scared the living hell out of some of our staff. "When do I get my graduate work? I can't stand those monsters 12 months!" Real sincere personal problems. Not too many educational problems. And so we did like we have always done in our district, and we find that this pays the most dividends for us anytime that we have any curriculum work, any research work, something which teachers should be involved in, which is about everything because they are the ones in the firing line. They are in face to face contact with students. We pay them $5.00 an hour for this kind of work. We tried the old honor scatus bit, of appointing them to committees after school and this didn't work. Then we decided we will catch them fresh and we will have committee meetings before school starts. We have been through this gambit, and I imagine you have, too. It doesn't work -- you are not really paying them this much. By the time you take out pension and taxes, it's peanuts. But believe me it is the best money that we invest. And we felt that probably that we would get nowhere with solving some of the big important problems until the teachers' personal nitty gritty was solved. That is the first challenge that we gave them. We made it a point that the administration at the district level and the building level keep clear out, and representative teachers from all of our buildings from all grade levels formed a committee of twenty-five and started solving their own nitty gritty. Their first fear was that Johnny and Susan in first grade will have four different teachers. "Well, they go to school fourty-five days. They're gone 15, when I come back I won't have the same classroom." "Who's going to move my desk, my filing cabinet, all of my educational materials," -- And a period of these kinds of nitty gritty problems that aren't pure educational, but we've learned a long time ago that you don't change education until you first change teachers. Back when we were a rich district that I was describing we bought everything that IBM had to sell, 3M and everything else. And I sat there, proud and fat, thinking that we had done the best -- thinking that we were really doing the curriuclum job, till we finally discovered that you change nothing permanently or lastingly until you've changed teachers. So this committee solved their own little nitty gritty first and then began, surprisingly enough, to find ways to get around these theoretical educational problems. For example, they have desinged what they call, and you can put any kind of a name on it you want, cooperative teaching, where when ninety students come in at first grade, they are exposed to three teachers the first two weeks, intimately and closely. This is the triad of teachers that will deal with the students through the whole year. And their scheduling process is so set that never are more than 1 of those 3 on vacation, so there are always two left that a child can identify with. I think it has another little side benefit, too. I think that from time to time, and maybe increasingly so as each year goes on, either

Johnny is not so hot or the teacher is not so hot or they are both fair and it is just a personality conflict. But now Johnny has a chance to identify with one of three teachers, his chances are better. And if he can make that identification, she or he can at least protect him against the other two. So we are beginning to find little kinds of ramifications that might indeed enhance or improve education. We have already thought of a hundred different things that we can do to improve curriculum if we can find the money. As I stated in the beginning, our task was to handle the onrush of students without lowering the quality of our present educational program and keep the school doors open and this was the task. Now, basically we call it "forty five-fifteen." Some wag has said that it takes forty five people fifteen minutes to explain it and they are probably correct. But what it is, and the reason we were specific about dates, another sacred cow that we didn't challenge was of course, as was mentioned in Pennsylvania is true in Illinois, there is an exact number of days that a child must be exposed to be educated. At least the opportunity for exposure must be there, whether they show up or not. So we found in our research as we looked at many different plans that were written, theorized or failed, that very few if any guaranteed the same exact number of days in school attendance for all students in the community. It was surprising to me to realize, I don't know why I never thought of it before, in any given year, there might be one less or one more weekend than the last and, this can screw up a calendar. So we designed a five-year calendar that gives each tract an exact 180 days. Mainly to see if we would bind up on the cycle problem and cycle ourselves to death. And so it turns out, that June 30, approximately ⅕ of our student body starts and goes 45 consecutive class days. Fifteen days after June 30 the next force starts. Fifteen days later the next force starts, and at this time our schools are at full capacity with ⅗ of our students still out on vacation. Fifteen days later, the group that started June 30 now has 45 consecutive days in school and they take off 15 school days of vacation. The fourth group comes in and then the cycle goes on forever. Never again will there be an end to the school year. One of the real personal advantages I see in this program is not ever again will we have to have an eighth grade graduation. Our community, was basically in it's originality an agriculture community, and if you were born and raised on a farm as I was, you know what eighth grade graduation means. That's been a thorn in my side for a long long time. I'll try to summarize in about five or ten minutes. I think probably in the terms of staffing, in the terms of curriculum, in the terms of legislation, you could spend a whole day on each facet-- A whole day. Needless to say, our assistant manager is going out of his mind and the business manager -- twenty two different contractual offerings! My answer is sweet and simple. I back off and say, "We preach individualizing for students, that's the only thing to do. Why can't we individualize for teachers? You've got your computers, we pay enough to rent them. Plug it in, wire it up and spit it out." One of the other little nitty gritty concerns teachers have are what do we do with sick leave. This had to be prorated too. Well, for fifteen years, I've taught school nine months a year, and I got a full years credit on the pension system, now I work 12 months, do I get 1¼ credit on the pension system? There is an easy answer to that. All administrators work 12 months and they pay on their full salary to the pension system, so the precedent was set. They indeed get no other pension than a year for a year. At first, our State Legislature told us, "Well, you can only draw pension on nine months of pay, the other three months will have to be social security." We went down and

lobbied around and got that changed. We were going to have enough book work. And you would be amazed at what you can change at a state legislative level if you go down early enough and work long enough and stay up late enough. It can be done and it takes a few credit cards and it takes a little money, but it can be done. And when I talk money, I talk in terms of a steak dinner and a box of cigars and an appropriate box of candy for the secretary so you can get in the door. We are so far down the road now that we couldn't back off now if we found it was a calamity. But I can remember a year or eighteen months ago, I used to get on the same airplane with John Earlinborn so I could have a conference with him because I couldn't get any schedules in Washington. He'd get off and I'd get on the next airplane and come back. I used to spend hours in Senator Dirksen's and Senator Douglas's office. This is the kind of [illegible] work that it takes. You can't overlook any facet. You can't expect [illegible] legislature to understand and know and to realize and to have empathy with all of your problems. You've got to educate them. Their tasks and their challenges are far wider than education, as was pointed out for example in Pennsylvania, 56% of the budget. The other 44% needs consideration too, and their time has to be divided. We are in a position that we put our total time on education. And I find this out, it became almost axiomatic that the solution was so simple to me, why can't all these yo-yos understand it? But I lived it and breathed it, and slept it for twenty-four hours a day for two years, it should be understandable to me. And that's a trap that you can fall into, in terms of your community. Now we sent out last Christmas, the first day of vacation, the first letter to all of our parents stating what track their children would be on next year and what vacation schedules they would have. And we purposely sent it out the first day of Christmas vacation and we all cleared out. We all cleared out. We came back to school fourteen days later and there were two irate letters and one irate phone call. We sent out 3300 letters. We're still a little shell-shocked about this. The only answer I have for it is we do and have over the years worked very very hard on public relations. This is why we have passed 15 educational tax rate increases without a defeat. It pays off. I think that the educator today has to be a pure propagandist and politician. It is the only way to succeed. I know there are some areas, I am missing, some areas you would be interested in, in terms of teachers contracts, for example, there are five basic contracts, the typical 180-day contract where a teacher tracks with the students. The child goes 45 days, goes home 15 days, the teacher does the same thing. There are some teachers who love this, they can go home now, at least three weeks out of every nine, catch up on the laundry, cook a square meal for Dad, take care of the family obligations, do a little sewing and just collapse and regather their wits. Then we have 195-day contracts, 210, 225, 244 and 277 and there are variations in between that are individualized for the teacher who wants this particular time off either for vacation, or graduate work. And something else that teachers soon discovered for themselves. The teacher who is 55, 56, 57 years old -- if they can now teach five years under year-roundedness, they can also increase their pension by a third. In Illinois, your pension is figured on your best five consecutive years of the last ten you teach. And I'm sure that from now, I will have some teachers that are pensioning out at a higher pension than most of the principals in the state of Illinois. All of a sudden they caught on that there were some personal benefits for

teachers. I had mentioned maybe a half a dozen or a dozen of the little things when you place them against the total scope of the whole problem and picture. But to each individual teacher or student or parent or administrator they are not that little. And these little ones can't be pushed aside and say we got the bigger picture to worry about. The nitty gritty you have to take day by day and you have to solve it. I'll close by saying that we were fortunate to get a grant, federal money in which there is research going on now for the dissemination of this project and designing tools and instruments to measure the growth or retardation of what we do to children with year-roundedness. This should be done hopefully sometime in July and I would guess sometime in late summer it would be published and out, and it would be available. Here's another little nitty gritty I'll throw in before I close. All of a sudden about two weeks ago, it dawned on us that people like Binet, Stanford, Otis, Metropolitan, all of their norms for the normal testing package that you and I buy for the nine months school, isn't going to work with year-roundedness. So now we've got a couple of them working, trying to see how they are going to attack the problem and develop new norms. And I mention these little things just to point out that when you think that you have got it all, you haven't, because when you wake up the next day, there's another one.

SECOND GENERAL SESSION

Presiding: R. Dale Weizenecker
Assistant Superintendent of Schools
Brevard County, Florida

SECOND GENERAL SESSION

Presiding: Dale Weizenecker

One other little bit of interest to Brevard County and then we'll go on to the program. We now have a superintendent named White. He succeeded this man by the name of B. Frank Brown. Brown succeeded a man by the name of Charles Green. So after having served with a Green, Brown and a White, I've decided that a man with a name like Weizenecker really doesn't have a chance. We probably have at this time two of the most knowledgeable practitioners in the field of education regarding the extended school year. And without any further ado we are going to start with Reid Gillis, the Coordinator of Year-Round Education from Fulton County, Georgia.

SECOND GENERAL SESSION

Address: Reid Gillis
Coordinator of Year-Round Education
Fulton County, Georgia

YEAR-ROUND PROGRAMS IN GEORGIA AND FULTON COUNTY'S PROGRAM

by
Reid Gillis

I am going to tell a story that my superintendent told me and as I said a few days ago, it's a funny story because he told it and when he tells me a story, it's always a funny story. I don't know about Dale, but when my superintendent tells me a story, I really laugh. So I am going to pass this funny story on to you. This friend of mine was very jealous and he went home from work one day and he went into an upstairs apartment and as he walked in the door he realized that someone else had been there during the afternoon and in a panic stricken condition, he rushed through the apartment. He looked under the bed; he looked in the closets; he looked everywhere. The search took him to the kitchen. He looked out the window of the kitchen and sure enough, a guy was running to his car putting his shirt on underneath the kitchen window. The nearest thing to him was the refrigerator so he grabbed the refrigerator and shoved it out the window. He hit the poor guy on the ground and he just smashed him right on the spot. And at that moment, the guy had a heart attack himself and died. As stories go he went up to the pearly gates and St. Peter was there with his pen and checklist, checking them in. He said, "What's your name?" The first guy stepped up and said, "My name is Harry." He said, "Harry, what happened to you?" He said, "In a fit of anger, I was in a jealous rage, and I pushed this refrigerator out the window and that's the last thing I remember. I apparently had a heart attack and died." St. Peter said, "That's alright. You know, that doesn't sound too bad, come on in." The next guy stepped up and he said, "What's your name?" He said, "My name is Sam." He said, "Sam, what happened to you?" "Man," he said, "I don't know. I was going to work. I was running late. I was trying to get to my car and dress at the same time and all of a sudden, something hit me and that's all I remember. "Here I am." He said, "Well, no fault of yours, come on in." The third guy steps up and he said, "What's your name?" He said, "Mac." "Mac, what happened to you?" "Man, I don't know. The last thing I remember, I was hiding in this guy's refrigerator."

So you see, my superintendent tells some pretty funny stories. I want to tell you about the Fulton County four quarter plan as it relates directly to the Fulton County Schools System in Georgia, and also the Georgia concept of extending the school year. And I share the same sentiment at this point with Ken Hermansen, who spoke a few minutes ago. I have the task about telling you about a program. So the details, I hope, we can get to so you will understand the kind of program we offer and some of the detail and some of the concepts under which this program was developed. First of all, let me just state that in the last eighteen months we have seen a tremendous surge of interest in the Year-Round School concept - Atlantic City, AASA local school districts around the country having local conferences - the National School Board Association of San Francisco. These things have already

been mentioned this morning, but I just want to point to these to bring to your attention again the national interest in the Year-Round concept -- The Year Round School concept. Now, as the Lieutenant Governor pointed out this morning, when you say the Year-Round School Concept or the Year-Round School or the 12 month school, then we must have a couple or three hundred people in here and I dare say that you would get about 175 different opinions or interpretations of what this means. So I would like to present to you in the very beginning of this, a proposition that the first thing you have to do in terms of developing a new school program, whether it is extended school year or whatever it is, is to identify the kind of program that you are planning to implement. Identify it, and then tell your people in your community and your schools what it is. In other words I'm saying, develop an educational philosophy, under which you will develop your program and then tell your people what you are talking about. So around the bridge table and around the grocery store, and the beauty parlor and the barber shop, when people talk about your extended school year program, then everybody is talking about the same thing and thinking about the same thing. This is a must that I will get to a little bit later in planning to implement an extended school year, a four quarter plan, or a 12 month school year or whatever you are going to call your plan. When schools opened in Fulton County, Georgia in 1968, in September, a new era in public education, in that community took place. Students entered the secondary school program with the educational opportunities that they had never had before. And under our old program, educational opportunities that we could not offer students. To be specific, I am talking about a four quarter plan in which all four quarters are approximately the same time in duration. As you can immediately see, it didn't take a steering committee or a brain trust to divide the calendar into four equal parts. This was, after deciding what we wanted to do, it was the easiest thing we had to do. It was to agree on quarters instead of tri-mesters or some other school arrangement, we decided on quarters. But it didn't take us long to find out what the real problem would be in developing this program. This was a complete curriculum revision. But let me put that in reverse, just a minute. Say, we wanted to do something for our children in Fulton County, Georgia, and we used the four quarter concept as a vehicle through which we could do these things. A group of principals met in Athens, Georgia, University of Georgia, in 1965. They studied for three days and three nights. There were sixty of them. They brought in Bob Bush from Stanford, B. Frank Brown from Melbourne, Florida, and some other school people to discuss some of the problems of education. Discipline, faculty, staffing, utilization of facility, textbooks, these things really bugged school administrators. And you know after three days, these people decided, these principals, high school principals, decided that the first thing that we have to do before we can improve education for our Kids, is to do something with the calendar and with this traditional nine month school year. That's a very simple statement to come out of a meeting, but take a look at it for just a minute. A traditional nine month school year. What they were saying was this: that when the kid came to school in September, he registered in a course that lasted till June, to get one Carnegie unit

credit. He went in, in September, and tried to get a unit credit by June 4th. And in many cases, after about three weeks, the kid and the teacher both knew that the kid had failed and we just couldn't do anything about it. He just sat there and failed and failed and failed. So, to do something with this nine month school year, really opens up a tremendous change in school concept in a change in thinking of the people involved in the school district. What do you do with it when you change it? Do you just change it and offer more of what you have been offering for nine months? Or do you try to develop a program to really meet the needs of the kids in your school district? Well, coupled with the concept of the four quarter system, take a look at why we are going into the new school program in the first place. This educational philosophy that I mentioned. Why are you doing it? We agreed that we had to first of all take a look at the child, see what he needs, and then develop courses to meet those needs. On a quarter basis, but that still didn't solve our problem. We still couldn't just develop these American History classes, divide it into three or four parts and say, "Here is a new program that we are going to use for our kids." We had to take a look at the content. What are we teaching the children? And how are we teaching it to them? This scares everyone to death. Really, when you start talking about this change of content and teaching methodism and procedures. But a group of very talented classroom teachers and department chairmen were challenged to rely as a curriculum on the basis of the needs of the child. Now, before I get into any further comment about curriculum revision, let me set the stage, physically, of our school calendar for you. It is a four-quarter calendar, in which students are required to attend three of the four quarters. Now we are talking about the equivalency of a school year because we are still operating under the state program. They are required to attend three of the four quarters. They may attend all four. It is an optional attendance program. We are saying that when the program is fully implemented, that the student may choose the quarter he would like to stay out. He may stay out first quarter, and go to school the next three. He may go one, stay out one and go two, if he would like to have this option. Now this is very significant in the overall concept of our program --the attendance option. We abandoned the Carnegie unit. We do not give a unit credit in our school system any longer. We do not teach English for a year. We teach English for a quarter. The student takes it, he passes this quarter then he takes another quarter of English. If he passes it, he gets five credit hours for passing that course--just like college. If he fails it, it is a decision to make. He either takes the course over again or he can reschedule something that will meet his needs. So we abandoned the Carnegie unit. We got the kids out of this straight jacket of registering for a course in September, staying in it until June, trying to get a Carnegie unit. Of course this is pretty hard to live with, you know, at the beginning. Students are required to have three hundred and seventy hours for graduation. A parent calls a counselor and says, "How much credit does my kid need to graduate?" You say, "Only 285 credit hours." It is pretty hard for us to get accustomed to, but our counselors, our school administrators, our teachers, agree that this is one of the finest things that we did. We put all of the courses on a complete credit equivalency. Everything gets the same amount of credit, if the class is held for five days a week, 55 minutes a period. This opens up another possibility that I hope I have time to mention, to talk to you a little bit later. Well, when you change the total concept of the school year, put in here a new philosophy of education. Change the thinking of the people involved,

then you can do anything you want to do. This is the real premise on which we started working on curriculum revision. Now, let me use English, if I may, as an example. Around our area, students were required in grades 9 through 12 to have 8 semesters of English. And we found that in many parts of that area, we had 8 semesters of English. We had maybe a remedial reading course or two, and we had a couple of readvanced placement courses in English. But basically the kids who went through the secondary schools had to take the same semesters of English with these few variations. And these were year courses in English. Traditionally sequential, you had to have English 101 before you had English 102 and English 102 before you had 103, and so forth. In our present program, we have something like 50 courses in English developed, from a course in communication skills for a kid who can't read, a disabled reader, up through a sophisticated course in Shakespear called the Tragedy of Drama for students who are going into college that would really like to do an indepth study of Shakespear for one quarter. Now keep in mind, that these are quarters courses that are non-sequential where possible, and terminal at the end of the quarter, just like a college course. Non-sequential is the key here, to being able to do some of the things that I mentioned before. Non-sequential. Alright, with these 55 English courses that are non-sequential, we can program students, or I should say, we can let students program themselves into courses that meet a need and an interest to move students into this more flexible schedule. Mathematics is the same way. We have a course in mathematics at the very low level that is a skills course to teach kids to manipulate numbers. You see these kids who can't read, who are disabled readers, coming in the eighth grade. They can't do much with arithmetic either. So these courses are designed for kids who need the skill of manipulating numbers, with 45 math courses developed, up through a sophisticated course of creative mathematics designed in conjunction with Georgia Tech and MIT, which allows the students to develop their own mathematics concepts--The real top-level masters. So really what I am saying is, that in a program of this nature, that is designed of quarter courses, non-sequential students can come into the program where they are and move as far as they can go, through our program. Now this is a lot of talk about curriculum and what does the four-quarter have to do with it? I hope I have time to get to that after while. So you see, I am really not talking about a program to save money, to save building facilities, using facilities year round and this kind of thing. I am talking about a program designed to improve the educational opportunities of our children. I am going to say that often in the next few minutes so I want you to keep that in mind. I'm not saying that the other program will not improve the educational opportunities of the children, they will. As Dr. Hermansen and I talked about this. His program will improve the educational opportunities of the children for various and obvious reasons. But ours is designed as a primary purpose to improve education. Even mathematics, when it is carefully analyzed, can be designed in the quarter courses that are in about seventy per cent of the cases, non-sequential. Now for you math people out here, this could be a staggering statement, but our friends at MIT, Carnegie Tech, Georgia Tech, these engineering schools have come down as consultants working with us have worked with our department chairman, our teachers in developing this conceptual mathematic courses that are beautiful and designed to meet the needs of the kids. I use one more area of the curriculum to make the point of the non-sequential curriculum. Now I've been asked on several occasions, and I'm sure some of you are asking, you know, how does this really improve education?

What have you done to improve the course content in presenting the material to the kid of the modern day? What does it mean to him? Is it pertinent, is it valuable? Is it vital? I have to use social studies to make this point. You know, we are required in Georgia to teach a year of American History. An equivalent of a year of American History, to every student of the upper grades of our high school before they can graduate. In the past we have taught American History and we started with the discovery and if we were lucky, I said last night, we got through Eisenhower or to Eisenhower. And my colleagues at the table said we were lucky to get through World War I but you got in there someplace before spring in a chronological approach to history. Well let's take a look at American studies or American culture from a little different angle. Let's develop a quarter course in the new social studies concept. Have quarter courses designed around justice. One around democracy. One around the Constitution. One around the Revolution. One around the communistic movement in America. These kinds of courses that bring to life a study of American History and when a teacher is teaching a unit on revolution, social and industrial, she could put it on the calendar any place. The calendar really becomes insignificant. It's the concept that is significant. So we have really changed the total concept of social study. Bringing it into focus of today and trying to teach our kids what it means to be an American citizen. Rather what it meant when Columbus tried to discover America. Oh, incidentally, we do have a unit in discovery that deals with Columbus and Drake and these others and Armstrong on the moon and these areas of discovery. So we haven't abandoned the idea. But also we have a very important and significant unit on American men. And this is my favorite. I really believe in George Washington and Abraham Lincoln and these people, but I'm trying to do this unemotionally, you know. So I won't get into it very deeply, I do get emotional about it. But this is the kind of program that you can develop when you abandon some of the traditional concepts of American education. It's very difficult. John Letts, the Superintendent of Atlanta after a meeting of heated discussion about curriculum change one day, and the steering committee said, "man, it sure would be easy to leave it like it is." And he was right. It's easy to leave it like it is. Alright, let me tell you a few points of the program to get off of this kick. We talked about the four quarters, it is a quarter program with the complete curriculum revision with seventy per cent of our courses structured non-sequentially. About the only thing that we have left sequential is some mathematics, some science, the only science sequential is chemistry. The science people said we have to leave chemistry sequential. And language, up to a point. Foreign language must be built on a sequential nature up to a point. But up to a point in French we have fifteen or twenty French courses developed at the advanced language that kids can take non-sequentially. I'd like to emphasize just one more time on a point I made a few moments ago, that we do not teach courses in any school of our system for a year. We teach it for a quarter. And we have, as I said, 45 math courses, 55 English courses, we have 30 something science courses developed. Social study people, we had to say please stop developing courses because you have too many now and you have 82 more on the drawing board. You know, this is too many. So we wind up with all of these courses, but what does it really mean? You know, we've patched up the curriculum and added to it for forty years, to the point that you can't schedule kids into it now on a semester basis. So what are you going to do with 582 courses in a high

school? Well let's put these courses in order in the school system. Develop the course, identify the material, identify the supplementary material. Forget the textbook and use material that is relevant to teaching the course and set up a program of scheduling kids on a quarter basis. In North Springs High School is a wealthy suburban area in which 93 per cent of the kids who graduate go to college. Now, obviously, we would never need the agriculture course in North Springs High School and, by the same token, we would not need the creative mathematics course probably in the small rural school or in the north end of the county. So, what I'm really saying is that with the non-sequential quarter program, designed to (I hate to say this, but) meet the needs of the kids, you can design master sketches in curricular offerings to satisfy not only your school but your community at the same time.

Or another saying is that you can have a beautiful program in your school but you must have a scheduling procedure so that you can let kids get involved in the courses. We do have a program of scheduling. We schedule kids every quarter in our school - we have 18 high schools - and I should rephrase that. The kids schedule themselves with the elective program, and I won't spend time going into the details of this, but I'll be glad to talk to any of you later who may be interested. We have a pre-registration in which the student chooses his own course. Then we have from this tally a master schedule made. The kids then put themselves in class on a two-day scheduling procedure we have set up between courses. The very next day you start the next course, so that the principal and his staff are tied down too much trying to work out a master schedule in which all of the conflicts must be worked out so that every kid can schedule his sequential next course. You see if the kid scheduled for English in 301 happens to have a conflict this quarter, it really doesn't matter. He can schedule for 302, and take 301 next time it comes around. Scheduling procedure then must be worked out to accomodate any new concepts and I'm still trying to say that you can't do the same old thing that you've been doing under a new name. You've got to change it, and if you change one part of it, you've got to change a lot of parts. Someone said that it's just as easy to have 35 things going different as it is one because to just change one, you really have things fouled up then. You've got to change some other things to accommodate the one so when you get the thing going, it's not too difficult to change.

Well, we talk about the different byproducts of programming. The primary program in Fulton County is to improve the educational opportunity but obviously we cannot isolate a school in the community and develop a program that does not affect all of these other things. And, as I just got through saying, if you change one thing, there are a lot of other things you have to change. So the same is true inside a community. What happens to the community? What has happened in our community? How does it relate to the program in the school?

Well, I'd like to comment about this, not as a byproduct program, but as a real basic rationale for developing the program to what we saw in it earlier. This is a possible solution to the dropout problem. In Georgia we had to think about this. I don't know about you folks, but we in some

parts of Georgia are way up on the list of dropouts, percentage wise. So we had to consider as we were doing this that possibly we were approaching the solution to the dropout. Now, considering the things I've said about the nonsequential program being able to reschedule kids at the end of that quarter. Here's a kid that has never achieved in his life. Here's a kid that has been waiting since he was 12 until he was 16 so he could drop out of school. Why? Because we did not have a program in our school developed so that we could meet his needs. We could not reschedule him when he started failing. This math course I mentioned earlier, this very low level skills math course, is a success oriented course. Why would you fail a kid in a course like this because he can't add when he never could add you never taught him to add? So why not have a course at this level that is enough success oriented so that this kid can feel a little bit of a success for the very first time in his life? Some of them are. Some of them are experiencing success in these programs. That never happened before. One little boy said to his math teachers, "They've told me all these years that I didn't know anything about mathematics, but boy, I'm doing it today." And all he was doing was just adding up a few figures, a few columns of numbers. He was experiencing success. Let's move it up on a little higher level, however, as a counselor and principal of a high school, I never knew a kid that could achieve that became a dropout--an academic dropout. There are other reasons why kids drop out of school but many of those are related to the lack of achievement. Perhaps programs designed not to give the kid a grade but have courses designed to which you can schedule a kid (or kids, I should say) that have similar characteristics in the program to meet whatever academic needs they have. We feel that by being able to reschedule the kids, identify their problems on a quarter basis rather than on a yearly basis, we could save some of these kids that are dropping out of school when they are 16, and some who dropped out mentally when they were 13 or 14 and just waiting for the legal age to drop out or leave school. Some of the byproducts quickly. A school-work arrangement. Now we get into the four quarter bit. All this I've talked about is just school reorganization in the curriculum. But now the four quarters broadens the base for your program. Just quickly - a student going to Carnegie Tech, for example, would be on a very strict academic program. He would have his nose to the grindstone semester after semester getting math and science and English and these courses to get in to Carnegie Tech and to meet the college board scores, never having an opportunity to take art and music and these kinds of courses that he really wanted to take along the way. But in this program a student can prepare himself for Carnegie Tech and get a minor in music at the same time or a minor in art or a minor in both if he'd like to at the same time because you broaden a base of four quarter plan in which kids can schedule themselves. In other words, I think there are something like 22 courses that a student can take above the required course for graduation and college admission, so you can figure this out for yourselves. Now, the work-school situation. A student could go to school part time and go to work part time and still graduate when his class graduates. This is being done and this was one of the first things the kids jumped on in our area. These pre-arranged programs of work-school. This is different from other work-school arrangements. This is a kid who really goes to work but he goes to school part time and goes to work part time. The colleges are

looking at this very favorably. As a matter of fact, in our area in Georgia we have all four-quarter colleges. The kids when they meet graduation requirements may leave school if it's at the end of their first quarter of their senior year, if they have met 375 of the right credits, they may leave school and go to college at the beginning of the next college quarter. Now, the college people tell us that this is probably the greatest thing that ever happened to them. The reason kids can't get the college of their choice in September is because all kids go to school on September 10. So, if you have students enrolling in college at the beginning of each college quarter, this will relieve this type situation. We're told by the college people that the girls get homesick and go home after the first quarter and the boys flunk out. I don't know how true that is but they have empty beds, empty rooms after the first college quarter during the course of the year on a quarter basis.

The next thing that I'd like to mention is a byproduct of the program in dealing with work. It goes back to attendance option. You see even in the Atlanta area we have about 175,000 high school boys and girls going out on the street on June 4. You look at New York, Chicago, Washington, D. C., Detroit, and you have a lot larger number. But in our area, these kids are out of school for the summer and they have nothing to do. They can't find employment. They stand around and look at each other or try to find something to do, and usually they do, and get into trouble. But if adding an attendance option so that the student can hop down a quarter during the year and work, you put the labor on the market when it's needed. Now, someone asked the question this morning, "Is industry pushing this program?" Well, industry is excited about it. After talking to the board of directors of the Atlanta Chamber of Commerce recently, one business man called me at the office and said "You know, I can hire two teenagers yearly in my business but obviously I can't do it unless I pick up a dropout or something of this nature. But under your plan, I could hire eight teenagers, give them a fulltime job a quarter at a time and use the labor when it's on the market." So this we think is a real byproduct. Juvenile delinquency runs hand in hand with this. The Governor's Commission on Juvenile Delinquency studied this very carefully and proposed to the Governor as his first consideration in his budget for this year to really push this concept to a quarter plan, to get the kids off the street and get them in the work and school arrangements on a year round basis. Well, we have many, many others that I won't go into at this time but obviously you can see the point I'm making is that when you loosen up your program and allow these attendance options, all sorts of things can happen in improving the educational opportunity for boys and girls. Excuse me, I missed a point I wanted to make so let me identify it here right quickly if I may. I think one of the things that this program provides, if nothing else, it has involved the students and teachers together in a real work arrangement of education. The teachers in Fulton County are responsible for the new curriculum. They were challenged early to get involved with department chairmen and curriculum coordinators in suggesting changes in curriculum so that when the course guides were put together in this new quarter concept the teacher could see herself or himself in this new curriculum. The students were involved in developing these new social studies programs as it related to the classroom

work. We had a group of students and a teacher to actually develop a complete unit course guide this thick on revolution in America. Twenty-two kids in a classroom and a teacher worked a full quarter developing this and then two more quarters on their own time. They didn't have enough time during a quarter so they worked the rest of the year at night and afternoons putting together this concept of American revolution - industrial and social - and the ramifications of it. I'm sure I did not ask Dr. Johnson from Jefferson County if I could comment about this, but I'll take a chance.

One of the things I'm really excited about today in student involvement, Dr. Johnson and Dr. VanHoose from Jefferson County, Kentucky, have visited our program and are considering, as has been said already today, moving into a year-around school concept. Dr. Johnson called me the other day and said "How about me sending 18 kids, one from each of my schools, to your school system for a couple days. Let them come down and go to class. Can you farm them out to other students and let them come back the next day and visit?" I was just delighted to have that opportunity. I called a couple principals and I asked, "Could you accommodate nine kids all day and over night? Without question they said "Yes." This is just the greatest thing that could happen to us. Not to Dr. Johnson and his group but to get kids in our school system to take a look at what we're doing and does it make sense? So we'll critique these kids, Dr. Johnson, before they get back to you to see just what they found out about our school system and if they didn't find out the right things, we'll tell them before they go back. But I'm sure our board of education will be very anxious to find out what kids really think about the program. This is student involvement and this is what will make the program tick along with the teacher involvement in revising the curriculum. You see, I really have the old-fashioned belief that the classroom teacher is a significant thing in it and when she closes the classroom door behind her or behind him, this is when your program is a success or a failure. I don't care what you've done at the administrative level. If your faculty is not with you, then that teacher is going to get in that classroom and close the door and talk very softly and do what she has done for 40 years--if she's not with it. So you've got to get that going. Another thing you must do is involve the community early as I said. The involvement of the faculty, the student and the community is inseparable and in our program this has been a public relations program that we have never attempted before. Immediately when you decide on the kind of program you want to go into, get hold of your newspaper, your TV and radio and do something, whatever is necessary, to get them to start talking about it so that you can get these people involved. Now the thing that I think you'll find in your community when you start talking about a program to improve the educational opportunity for your children, your community will be with you. Then it will be up to you to implement the program.

Now, I'm sorry that I have rambled here trying to hit some of the high spots of our program and, as I said, I get a little emotional. I try not to cry but I do get emotional about it. In the session tomorrow morning, I'll be glad to go into detail or this afternoon I'll be in the lobby if there is any point of the program that you would like me to elaborate on, I'll be happy to.

SECOND GENERAL SESSION

Address: George Thomas
Coordinator of Year-Round Education
New York State Department of Education

PROJECTING SAVINGS IN CLASSROOM SPACE OR DOLLARS THROUGH RESCHEDULING THE SCHOOL YEAR

by

Dr. George I. Thomas

The combined meeting of school board members, teachers, and parents was drawing to an end. It had been a long drawn out session. Again and again questions had been raised about areas in which dollar savings could be saved and now it was time to call it quits for the day. The consultant made a move to put his charts away, but then he stopped as a deep booming voice shouted,

> "Are you telling us that we have to do something to reduce enrollments in order to save money?"

Of course the answer is "yes", yet it had taken that one individual from 8:00 PM to 11:30 PM for the fact to sink in. Unfortunately, there are many educators and astute citizens who take much longer to reach a similar level of understanding.

Dollar savings can be realized in many ways without the adoption of a rescheduled school year plan, but all too often they have a negative impact upon the school. This may be the reason educators are slow to accept the fact that adoption of an extended school year plan can lead to dollar savings without harming the school system. It is even more difficult for them to accept the fact that a more effective program can be instituted without expending as much or any more than would be spent for a regular school year program.

Changing Enrollment Flow Patterns

In order to realize a savings in classroom space or dollars the extended school year plan must ultimately lead to a change in enrollment flow patterns. If the ESY design fails to do this, another plan should be considered unless the economy goal is second or third in importance instead of first. Perhaps the simplest explanation of the term changing enrollment flow patterns can be illustrated by the following.

1. The Term Rotation or Cycling ESY Plans

   A lengthened school year calendar is adopted with the understanding that a large fraction of the students in a school system will be in recess at all times. Through the rotation of terms or cycles it is possible to increase the capacity of a school by 25, 33, or 50 percent.

2. Extended School Year Plans Based Upon Student Acceleration

   Several patterns of school organization have been developed

which use the extra learning time in a lengthened school year to reduce the total number of years of schooling. It should be understood at the beginning that it takes one to five years of operation to change enrollment flow patterns so if a school district wants space immediately, it should be very careful in the design selection. For example, the acceleration trimester design changes the nature of the enrollment flow pattern at the end of the fourth trimester. In contrast the Continuous School Year acceleration plan will take five years to release classroom space or dollars. In the meantime school costs will rise 8 or 10 percent per year. This is where people get discouraged. They want economy instantaneously and will not readily pay out extra cash to obtain a deferred dollar saving.

3. The Time Equalization Factor of the Multiple Trails Plan Changes the Day by Day Enrollment Patterns

The learning time allocated for mastery of a course is spread over a lengthened educational time line. The students are not out of school for an extended period of time. However, with time equalization they no longer have to spend as many minutes per week on a subject. Classroom space and teacher time can be acquired through the rescheduled student day without an extra outlay of funds during the first year.

It's Like Going to a Smorgasbord

Numerous critics rejoiced over a recent article in Nations School. "Look," they cried, "another school district has rejected year round schooling so what are you trying to sell us. Nobody is going to buy your lengthened school year plans!"

What they fail to realize is that the public was correct in rejecting the choice of offerings presented. In this case as in so many others the public had been exposed to a sampling of a smorgasbord array of extended school year plans. As a rule, it is not prepared to select one design from a choice of 5, 10, 15, 20, or more patterns of school organization. In recent years many individuals have developed an extended school year plan or a variation of an old one. Unfortunately, the various plans cannot be adopted with the expectation that they all lead to the realization of the same objectives.

The Primary Objective

Most supporters of the year round school or extended school year concept have economy as a primary objective. They desire a solution to a classroom space or dollar problem. A few, expecially professional educators, will seek an extended school year plan which will lead to the realization of higher educational goals. Frequently, they will reject the economy

objective even when it is clear that a more effective climate for learning will be a byproduct of extended school year plans which release classroom space.

There should be no conflict between those who place an educational objective ahead of the economy goal. However, the fact remains that the choice of extended school year plans can be quite different.

At the present time many school systems have committees studying the feasibility of an extended school year plan. It is recommended that they agree on their primary objective before selecting a pattern of school organization to test or to recommend to the public.

The Development of a Guide Sheet to Predict The Effectiveness of a Lengthened School Year Plan

If a committee or an individual is reviewing the literature on the extended school year, making visits to schools which have operated what may be considered an extended school year plan, or is merely trying to select one of several ESY plans to resolve a local problem, it is suggested that a guide sheet be prepared similar to one entitled "An Evaluation Guide for Predicting the Effectiveness of a Lengthened School Year Program." This exploratory questionnaire will clarify many points that are not always understood.

For example, people will ask why didn't you continue with the Commack Extended School Year Program. The answers can be found in the questionnaire. It was designated as an experimental program. As such it had definite values. We wanted to measure the impact on children. Economy, while important, was not the primary goal. Here, it was secondary. Again, it was voluntary. This showed that the Commack Program would have difficulty in realizing the economy objective. Again, the acceleration concept was being tested. It soon became evident that this approach would pose problems since large sums of money would be necessary to support an all school nonexperimental program through a six year transitional period.

On the basis of the review of the questionnaire we would now recommend adoption of a different plan to meet the local school districts space and dollar problem, for example, the Continuous Learning Year Cycling Plan. The evaluative guide can be used in whole or in part. It can be redesigned by the deletion of some questions or the addition of others. Ultimately, the answers should be considered in the light of the primary objectives.

The third column labeled, unknown, is interesting. In many instances an X will be placed in this column because of the limited amount of evidence which is available to the researcher. For example, most articles or reports on the Newark and Aliquippa Year Round School Programs shed little light on the political conditions which contributed to the demise of these programs.

AN EVALUATION GUIDE FOR PREDICTING THE EFFECTIVENESS OF A LENGTHENED SCHOOL YEAR PROGRAM

Directions: Place the appropriate symbols after each question:
Y for yes; N for no; X for unknown

Nature of the Question	Yes	No	Unknown
1. Was the program instituted as an experimental one to test the feasibility of one or more minor objectives?			
2. Was the program instituted primarily to take care of a temporary situation or an emergency?			
3. Did the program ever get beyond the experimental stage?			
4. Was the primary objective to save money?			
5. Was the primary objective to save classroom space?			
6. Was the primary objective designated as educational, one not dependent upon classroom space or dollar savings?			
7. Was the program based upon student acceleration?			
8. Was the program in operation long enough to create a reduction in the total enrollment of the school?			
9. Was the program based upon term rotation or cycling?			
10. Were steps taken to insure the equalization of enrollments during each term, quarter, or cycle?			
11. Was the program based upon the time equalization principles referred to as the Multiple Trails Plan?			
12. Was student participation mandatory?			
13. Were steps taken to reduce the number of teachers employed?			
14. Did teachers receive an increase in salary commensurate with legal and/or regular school year salary averages?			
15. Were steps taken to modify the curriculum or grouping practices to facilitate implementation?			
16. Did the new program provide extra learning time for students over a designated number of years?			
17. Did students show any ill affects from their involvement in a program requiring approximately 200 days of schooling per year?			
18. Was student learning as effective in the summer as it was in other seasons of the school year?			

Nature of the Question	Yes	No	Unknown
19. Were steps taken to insure that the parents understood the primary objectives of the new program?			
20. Was the extended school year plan selected suitable for the realization of the primary objective?			
21. Did the program require a greater degree of flexibility than was required for the regular school year program?			
22. Was the staff prepared to implement the new program?			
23. Was new legislation required for the implementation of the program?			
24. Were steps taken to evaluate the program in terms of the objectives?			
25. Was an effective cost analysis study made?			
26. Were comparisons made of the cost of operating the schools under the regular school year with similar ratios of students per teacher, per classroom, per bus seat?			
27. Was the program primarily limited to a designated age group? (Elementary, junior high, senior high, etc.)			
28. Did the program call for time equalization of terms, quarters or some other segment of the school year?			
29. Will students meet minimum legal attendance requirements if they do not work through a full year?			
30. Did the school administrators and school board members have ulterior motives when they announced their intent to institute a lengthened school year program?			
31. Did politics have anything to do with the termination of the extended school year program?			
32. Did economic factors have anything to do with the termination of the program?			
33. Was an inservice teacher training program instituted to facilitate implementation of the new program?			
34. Did the program involve a large number of children who may be designated as disadvantaged? (Socially, economically, academically, emotionally, physically)			
35. Were steps taken to insure that students were guided in the use of their free time, in or out of school?			

Dollar Savings, Fact or Fancy

"How can a school system save dollars through a rescheduled school year?" is a question heard over and over again. Many professional educators are vocally opposed to the word economy. They will insist on elimination of the term from our thinking. "You know that you cannot save money", they will state over and over again. It is hard to refute them with simple field studies because so many variables must be considered.

The Percentage Argument

A number of individuals insist on talking about dollar savings in terms of percentages. If this is the case one would use a base 10.6 percent of the net current expenditures for New York State or a national median of 11.9 percent. One school superintendent talked about savings in this category as "chicken feed." He said, "Debt service is such a small part of the total budget that it is not worth talking about." Be that as it may, the fact remains that the New York State per pupil cost of debt services adds up to $114.82 per pupil. In one representative district which recently lost its bond issue the percentage was 12.6 percent while the per pupil cost was $131.72.

Figures of this type have little meaning to the average taxpayer, therefore, it is suggested that dollar allowances be substituted in the local school districts for the percentage or per pupil cost figures. For example, one field study shows an increase of $1,123,500 in debt service charges with the building program for the regular school year. The recommended cycling plan cost will be $551,025 for a net saving of $572,475 in the third year of the new bond issue. Since the current (1968-69) allowance of $630,502 for debt service represents 18 percent of the budget, it is easy to predict some taxpayer protests if a building program adds over a million dollars to the annual budget.

The State Aid Argument

Many school districts sell a school bond issue to the public on the basis that the STATE will pay the major costs. This argument has been raised about the savings due to the operation of an extended school year program. Assume for example, that the State is paying 70 to 80 percent of the per pupil costs. A net saving of $800,000 represents a potential saving to the State of $560,000 to $640,000 or $240,000 to $160,000 to the local school district. This is where the local school administrator gets his "chicken feed" figure. The net savings begins to look small; however, he has overlooked the fact that many of his local taxpayers are also paying their share of the State expense.

Reasoning of this type may look ridiculous to the businessman who sees his tax dollars flowing into the Federal and State treasury rather than into the local tax office. The potential dollar saving is there, yet the

reduced saving to the local school district due to the State aid factor is a powerful deterrent. Many school administrators and school board members will not take on the responsibility of rescheduling their schools unless they can demonstrate the magnitude of the savings to their constituents.

Steps Taken to Project Dollar Savings In Selected Budgetary Categories

Numerous field studies have shown that it is necessary to go beyond the description of an extended school year plan. People are apt to say, "I understand the design," but they do not know how to procede. Therefore, the remainder of this presentation is devoted to what may be called, "Calculations Used to Show Potential Dollar Savings In Selected Areas of a School Budget." Hopefully, the procedures used will be acceptable to people coming from different states.

A Case Study

The Impact of a Rescheduled School Year Upon Central School District "R"

The School District

Central school district "R" consists of a number of rapidly growing suburban communities. Much of the growth has paralleled the growth of a large expansion of the I.B.M. plant in the area. Many of the homes are small. The older ones no longer pose a problem to the school district except where the older residents sell to newcomers who are just beginning to raise a family. Due to the unsettled economy there is considerable conjecture about the number of new homes that will be erected in 1970.

The school population increased from 9053 in 1964 to 13,356 in 1969. However, the growth rate has fluctuated from an increase of 1369 pupils in one year to a low of 509 in another. This uneven growth pattern makes it very difficult to plan on new school construction for the future. At present, the school district receives a large reimbursement of school costs through State aid payments. The assessed valuation per pupil is $6,856, whereas the full valuation is $20,387. This places the school district third from the bottom in a county containing 13 school districts. Their 1969-70 aid ratio was .635.

The Enrollment Projections

All cost projections are based upon the development of an enrollment projection. Normally, one should avoid making long range projections. In this case, the five year projections are made with the understanding that the local school district shall annually review its school building needs in terms of new data. Apparently, enrollment projections were the basis of considerable local conjecture and arguments, a great deal of which stemmed from the difficulty of establishing a figure which would be acceptable for the new kindergarten input.

One school board member used the live census count for his predictions, but this approach is dangerous due to the many variables which can determine its accuracy. He projects a kindergarten enrollment of 909 in 1975 whereas one of the educators predicted 1329 kindergarten children will be enrolled in 1975. Two separate enrollment projections were made by the researcher for the case study projections.

A. The Enrollment Projection with the Declining Kindergarten.

An arithmetic average of the last three entering kindergarten classes provided the computer with a ratio of .948864. Each year the kindergarten enrollment dropped approximately 5 percent. As a result the total elementary school enrollment began to show a decline. While the total school systems

ENROLLMENT PROJECTIONS FOR CENTRAL SCHOOL DISTRICT "R"
BASED ON DECLINING BIRTH RATE CALCULATIONS
1970-1975

Grade	Average Ratio	1970-71 Enrollments	1971-72 Enrollments	1972-73 Enrollments	1973-74 Enrollments	1974-75 Enrollments	1975-76 Enrollments
K	.948864	1268	1203	1141	1083	1028	975
1	.91172	1218	1156	1097	1040	987	937
2	.96369	1236	1174	1114	1057	1002	951
3	1.02089	1264	1262	1199	1137	1079	1023
4	1.01075	1172	1278	1276	1212	1149	1091
5	.99049	1145	1161	1266	1264	1200	1138
6	1.01916	1143	1167	1183	1290	1288	1223
Total K-6		8446	8401	8276	8083	7733	7338
7	1.05391	1089	1205	1230	1247	1360	1357
8	1.00317	985	1092	1209	1234	1251	1364
9	1.13434	1006	1117	1239	1371	1400	1419
Total 7-9		3080	3414	3678	3852	4011	4140
10	1.0082	964	1014	1126	1249	1382	1411
11	.929258	758	896	942	1046	1161	1284
12	.95728	693	726	858	902	1001	1111
Total 10-12		2415	2636	2926	3197	3544	3806
Total K-12		13,941	14,516	15,066	15,490	15,867	15,284

enrollment increases from 13,941 to 15,284 in 1975, a small decrease in the elementary school enrollment is seen in 1975 although the junior and senior high school enrollments continue to rise.

B. The Enrollment Projection with the Frozen Kindergarten Enrollment Input.

One big variable in predicting school building needs is the kindergarten enrollment. For illustrative purposes the computer ratio is replaced by the 1970 kindergarten forecast. This figure is frozen so each subsequent entering class is the same. Since all entering classes since 1966 had exceeded this figure, the assumption has been made that the enrollment forecast based on the preservation of the 1268 input is closer to reality than the others.

The total enrollment increases from 13,941 in 1970 to 16,131 in 1975. These figures reflect continued growth in secondary school enrollments with a slight decrease in the elementary school enrollments.

These illustrations point up a problem which has been encountered in many school districts. In order to demonstrate how or where space or dollar savings can be realized, it is necessary to agree on one set of figures. The haggling has to stop. For our case study the enrollment projections used are based upon the ratios developed from changing enrollments of the previous five years. The savings can be adjusted percentage wise to reflect any future enrollment projections which is acceptable to the public.

Current School Capacity

Figures should be compiled which show the actual capacity of existing schools in the school district. Sometimes this is not easy to obtain due to faulty reporting and a lack of understanding of what is meant by capacity. For example, a school that was built for 2,000 pupils may be currently housing 3,000 pupils through use of overlapping sessions, the use of makeshift rooms, or through increasing class size in excess of the rated classroom capacity. In the field study we found numerous art rooms or special rooms had been converted to classrooms. As a result schools are housing more students than the schools were supposed to house.

For cost prediction purposes, it is recommended that state approved capacities be used. For elementary school calculations kindergarten classrooms are given a capacity rating of 50 and elementary school classrooms are rated at 27. Thus, a 20 room elementary school with 2 kindergarten rooms and 3 sections of students in grades 1 to 6 will be given a rated capacity of 586.

Projecting Classroom Space Needs

PROJECTED CLASSROOM SPACE NEEDS FOR CENTRAL SCHOOL DISTRICT "R"
BASED ON ALLOWANCE FOR DECLINING BIRTH RATE
1970-1975

	Projected Classroom Capacity and Requirements WITHOUT Cycling Plan				Projected Classroom Capacity and Requirements WITH Cycling Plan			
	Elementary K-6	Middle School	Senior High	Total	Elementary K-6	Middle School	Senior High	Total
Enrollment--1970	8446	3080	2415	13,941	8446	3080	2415	13,941
Classroom Cap.--1970	7032	2250	4179	13,461	8790	2813	5224	16,827
Shortage or overage	- 1414	- 830	+ 1764	- 480	+ 344	- 267	+ 2809	+ 2,886
Enrollment--1971	8401	3414	2636	14,451	8401	3414	2636	14,451
Classroom Cap.--1971	7032	2250	4179	13,461	8790	2813	5224	16,827
Shortage or overage	- 1369	- 1164	+ 1543	- 990	+ 389	- 601	+ 2588	+ 2,376
Enrollment--1972	8276	3678	2926	14,880	8276	3678	2926	14,880
Classroom Cap.--1972	7032	2250	4179	13,461	8790	2813	5224	16,827
Shortage or overage	- 1244	- 1428	+ 1253	- 1,419	+ 514	- 865	+ 2298	+ 1,947
Enrollment--1973	8083	3852	3197	15,132	8083	3852	3197	15,132
Classroom Cap.--1973	7032	2250	4179	13,461	8790	2813	5224	16,827
Shortage or overage	- 1051	- 1602	+ 982	- 1,671	+ 707	- 1039	+ 2027	+ 1,695
Enrollment--1974	7733	4011	3544	15,288	7733	4011	3544	15,288
Classroom Cap.--1974	7032	2250	4179	13,461	8790	2813	5224	16,827
Shortage or overage	- 701	- 1761	+ 635	- 1,827	+ 1057	- 1198	+ 1680	+ 1,539
Enrollment--1975	7338	4140	3806	15,284	7338	4140	3806	15,284
Classroom Cap.--1975	7032	2250	4179	13,461	8790	2813	5224	16,827
Shortage or overage	- 306	- 1890	+ 373	- 1,823	+ 1452	- 1327	+ 1418	+ 1,543

PROJECTED CLASSROOM SPACE NEEDS FOR CENTRAL SCHOOL DISTRICT "R"
BASED ON FREEZING THE KINDERGARTEN ENROLLMENT
1970-1975

	Projected Classroom Capacity and Requirements WITHOUT Cycling Plan				Projected Classroom Capacity and Requirements WITH Cycling Plan			
	Elementary K-6	Middle School	Senior High	Total	Elementary K-6	Middle School	Senior High	Total
Enrollment--1970	8446	3080	2415	13,941	8446	3080	2415	13,941
Classroom Cap.--1970	7032	2250	4179	13,461	8790	2813	5224	16,827
Shortage or overage	- 1414	- 830	+ 1764	- 480	+ 344	- 267	+ 2809	+ 2,886
Enrollment--1971	8466	3414	2636	14,516	8466	3414	2636	14,516
Classroom Cap.--1971	7032	2250	4179	13,461	8790	2813	5224	16,827
Shortage or overage	- 1434	- 1164	+ 1543	- 1,055	+ 324	- 601	+ 2588	+ 2,311
Enrollment--1972	8462	3678	2926	15,066	8462	3678	2926	15,066
Classroom Cap.--1972	7032	2250	4179	13,461	8790	2813	5224	16,827
Shortage or overage	- 1430	- 1428	+ 1253	- 1,605	+ 328	- 865	+ 2298	+ 1,761
Enrollment--1973	8441	3852	3197	15,490	8441	3852	3197	15,490
Classroom Cap.--1973	7032	2250	4179	13,461	8790	2813	5224	16,827
Shortage or overage	- 1409	- 1602	+ 982	- 2,029	+ 349	- 1039	+ 2027	+ 1,337
Enrollment--1974	8312	4011	3544	15,867	8312	4011	3544	15,867
Classroom Cap.--1974	7032	2250	4179	13,461	8790	2813	5224	16,827
Shortage or overage	- 1280	- 1761	+ 635	- 2,406	+ 478	- 1198	+ 1680	+ 960
Enrollment--1975	8185	4140	3806	16,131	8185	4140	3806	16,131
Classroom Cap.--1975	7032	2250	4179	13,461	8790	2813	5224	16,827
Shortage or overage	- 1153	- 1890	+ 373	- 2,670	+ 605	- 1327	+ 1418	+ 696

For illustrative purposes the projected enrollments of the grade divisions, Elementary K-6, middle or Junior High School and Senior High School are shown in a two-section chart. The calculations on the left show the projected enrollments, current capacities and the shortages or averages that exist for each school level from 1970 to 1975.

The comparative classroom needs with adoption of an extended school year plan are shown on the right. Here the classroom capacity should reflect the nature of the design and the type of community. For example the case study shows the capacity at 125 percent of the base stated rated capacity. Thus: 7032 elementary pupil capacity x 125 percent = projected elementary school capacity of 8790. The 25 percent increase is used to show the potential increase inherent in the 8-2 cycling. If another design or extended school year plan is recommended such as the 9-3 or 45-15 plan the rated increase would be 33 1/3 percent. Thus: 7032 elementary pupil capacity x 133 1/3 percent = projected elementary school capacity of 9376.

In a refined study one will show the opening of one or more schools prior to 1975. Thus the classroom capacities for the regular school year would change as new schools begin operation. Each new school opened would automatically increase the extended school year projected capacity by 25 percent or 33 1/3 of the new facility. An adjusted chart would probably show the completion of a new school in 1972 or 1973, but end result will be the same for the regular school year whereas the needs for the extended school year would be less.

On the assumption that projected growth problems are correct the school district will have a potential classroom shortage of 2670 pupil stations by 1975. With the adoption of the continuous learning year cycling plan there would be a potential surplus of 696 pupil stations. With the adoption of the 9-3 or 45-15 plan the school would have a potential surplus of 1121 pupil stations.

Comparative School Construction Costs

In order to accommodate the enrollments anticipated between 1970 and 1975 School District "R" should build

a. One or more elementary schools to accomodate 1200 students.

b. One or more secondary schools to accommodate 2100 students.

The building of these facilities will meet the school building needs projected for September 1975 and would provide a surplus for the secondary school enrollments net surplus would approximate the 8-2 cycling plan surplus which would be available in 1975 without any additional construction.

Since it is anticipated that revised enrollment forecasts will be made in 1971 and 1972, the ultimate new school construction plans may be increased or decreased in terms of changing local conditions. Based upon 1969 school construction costs the projected classroom space needs will cost approximately $11,000,000.

COMPARATIVE SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION COSTS FOR
REGULAR AND EXTENDED SCHOOL YEAR PLANS

SCHOOL DISTRICT "R" PLAN 8-2 Cycling*

	PROJECTED SCHOOL BUILDING NEEDS FROM 1970 TO 1975							
	Regular School Year Needs				Extended School Year Needs			
	Elementary K-6	Middle School	Senior High	Total	Elementary K-6	Middle School	Senior High	Total
Space requirements (pupils) 1975	7338	4140	3806	15,284	7338	4140	3806	15,284
Current capacity	7032	2250	4179	13,461	8790	2813	5224	16,827
Shortage	- 306	- 1890	+ 373	- 1,823	+ 1452	- 1327	+ 1418	+ 1,543
Size of proposed building required	600	1900		NONE NECESSARY				
Dollar per pupil costs	$2500	$3800		NO EXPENDITURE				
Cost per school project	$1,500,000	$7,220,000		NO EXPENDITURE				
Potential Savings	$8,720,000							

*Based on allowance for declining birth rates.

COMPARATIVE SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION COSTS FOR
REGULAR AND EXTENDED SCHOOL YEAR PLANS

SCHOOL DISTRICT "R" PLAN 8-2 Cycling*

PROJECTED SCHOOL BUILDING NEEDS FROM 1970 TO 1975

	Regular School Year Needs				Extended School Year Needs			
	Elementary K-6	Middle School	Senior High	Total	Elementary K-6	Middle School	Senior High	Total
Space requirements (pupils) 1975	8185	4140	3806	16,131	8185	4140	3806	16,131
Current capacity	7032	2250	4179	13,461	8790	2813	5224	16,827
Shortage	- 1153	- 1890	+ 373	- 2,670	+ 605	- 1327	+ 1418	+ 696
Size of proposed building required	1200	2100		NONE NECESSARY				
Dollar per pupil costs	$2500	$3800		NO EXPENDITURE				
Cost per school project	$3,000,000	$7,980,000		NO EXPENDITURE				
Potential Savings	$10,980,000							

*Based on freezing the kindergarten enrollment.

COMPARATIVE CAPACITY OF CENTRAL SCHOOL DISTRICT "R"
WITH AND WITHOUT THE CYCLING PLAN

REGULAR SCHOOL YEAR



ENROLLMENT CAPACITY

TOTAL 16,811 PUPILS

CYCLING SCHOOL YEAR



ENROLLMENT CAPACITY

TOTAL 16,827 PUPILS

With the adoption of the cycling plan the school district will have sufficient classrooms to accommodate the increases in enrollments at least through 1976 without any additional school construction. The end result is a saving of $11,000,000 in capitol construction costs.

Savings In Debt Service Charges

Those who poo-poo savings in debt service charges are ignoring the fact that central school district "R" is currently spending $131.72 per pupil on debt service charges. This represents 12.6 of the annual outlay for education without the adoption of an extended school year, the taxpayers can anticipate a marked increase in the allowance for debt service.

The proposed long range school construction project costing $10,980,000 will cost $11,346,310 in new interest charges over the life of the bond issue. With adoption of the 9-3 plan, the interest charges at 6.2 percent will be reduced to $8,873,130. There are those who believe that the amortization of a bond issue over 30 years brings the cost down to a point where the annual interest costs are negligible. This is not true if one considers the following:

Interest Charges in New School Construction Projects

Year	Interest Payment 8-2 Plan	Interest Payment 9-3 Plan
1	$680,760	$540,640
3	643,560	512,740
5	606,300	483,290
7	568,850	452,290
9	528,550	418,500

When the school budget reflects a payment for interest plus a payment on principal the taxes must reflect an even greater outlay of funds thus:

Debt Service Charges for New School Construction Projects

Year	Total Payment Principal & Interest (8-2 Plan)	Total Payment Principal & Interest (9-3 Plan)
1	$980,760	$765,640

Debt Service Charges for New School Construction Projects (con'd)

Year	Total Payment Principal & Interest (8-2 Plan)	Total Payment Principal & Interest (9-3 Plan)
3	$943,560	$737,740
5	906,360	733,290
7	893,850	722,290
9	853,550	693,500

While a portion of these projected new debt service charges would be reimbursed by the state. The fact remains that some agency be it local or state will be responsible for a cost that could be eliminated through the adoption of a rescheduled school year.

Dollar Savings in School Plant Operation and Maintenance (Reduced Need for Buildings)

Cost studies of experimented ESY program and extensive summer school programs have failed to show any pronounced increase in school plant and maintenance costs. It is anticipated that there will be some budgetary categories where costs will go up. However, the true test of the impact of a rescheduled school year must be applied to all staff members, including custodians and others responsible for school plant operation and maintenance.

Most critics who express concern about operating costs fail to take into account the fact that fewer school buildings are needed in a large school system. This can reduce the total cost of operation considerably especially where an ESY program makes it possible to dispense with old and obsolete school buildings. In a growing school district such as Central School District "R" the costs must be calculated in terms of regular and extended school year costs for two different sets of buildings.

Current Operating Costs

The 1969 expenditure report for Central School District "R" showed an expenditure of $1,308,059 for school plant operation and maintenance. The WADA cost was $116.55. An allowance for retirement and fringe benefit costs for the non-certified staff members responsible for school plant operation and maintenance increases the total costs to $1,516,814 or $135.15 per pupil (W.A.D.A.)

Projected Operating Costs for New Buildings

Taxpayers who vote their approval of a new school seldom take into

POTENTIAL DOLLAR SAVINGS FOR CENTRAL SCHOOL DISTRICT "R" FROM REDUCED OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE COSTS WITH ADOPTION OF THE ESY CYCLING PLAN

Category	Elementary School Costs and Savings			Secondary School Costs and Savings		
	Per Pupil Costs	Number of Pupils	Potential Savings	Per Pupil Costs	Number of Pupils	Potential Savings
Personal Services	$72.03	1200	$86,436	$90.04	2100	$189,084
Equipment	5.67	1200	6,804	7.09	2100	14,889
Supplies and Materials	5.46	1200	6,552	6.83	2100	14,343
Fire Insurance	.30	1200	360	.38	2100	798
Other Expenses	1.81	1200	2,172	2.26	2100	4,746
Fuel and Utilities	21.10	1200	25,320	26.38	2100	55,398
Rental	2.62	1200	3,144	3.28	2100	6,888
Contract, Professional and Technical Services		1200				
Contract, Operation and Maintenance	7.53	1200	9,036	9.41	2100	19,761
Services from other Districts						
Total Operation and Maintenance of Plant			139,824			305,907
Employee Benefits						
Employee Retirement Costs* at 15.837%			13,689			29,945
Social Security Costs at 5.0%			4,322			9,454
Total Employee Benefits			18,011			39,399
Potential Savings			157,835			345,306
Composite Dollar Savings				503,141		

*Does not include an allowance for employees Retirement Supplement.
**All cost projections may be adjusted upward to reflect changes in the cost of living index.

account the cost of operation. This can be considerable, therefore, all cost studies should include recognition of what it would cost to operate one or two more schools with the regular school year calendar than would be necessary with an extended school year calendar.

A projection of the 1968-69 school plant and maintenance costs in teams of W.A.D.A. units gives one a rough picture of the new costs which can be anticipated with erection of one 1200 pupil elementary school and one 2100 pupil secondary school. The $116.55 W.A.D.A. cost, with no adjustments for increases over the next four or five years would lead the school board to assume that it will cost $139,824 to operate the new elementary school and $305,907 to operate the secondary school. With an allowance for staff retirement and fringe benefit costs, the costs increase to $157,835 and $345,306 respectively.

The adoption of a recommended cycling plan would eliminate the need for the two new schools and could lead to a composite saving of $503,141. This sum should more than offset any projected operating cost increases due to the extension of the school year program in existing schools.

Potential Savings in School Bus Operations

The major savings in transportation may stem from the reduced need for school buses. The reduction in the number of students attending school at any one time carries with it the implication that fewer buses will be needed. Existing school buses may be driven an extra month each year, but this extra cost is more than offset by the reduction in the number of school buses that have to be maintained and operated. Fewer buses means fewer bus drivers and maintenance workers. It may mean less garage space and, of course, less insurance.

Central School District "R's" Current School Bus Fleet

At present Central School District "R" has 117 school buses in operation. Each one is a standard 60 passenger bus. Approximately 28 of them are required to transport parochial school children so for this study the school bus fleet considered for calculating potential savings is one of 89 buses. Each bus is scheduled to make two or three round trips a day which means that each bus seat transports 2.5 pupils.

Future School Bus Requirements

The number of school buses required for regular or extended school year programs in the future has been calculated in terms of a school bus seat ratio of one bus seat for each 2.501 or 2.5 students. An increase in enrollment will lead to an expansion of the size of the bus fleet. Similarly, the decrease in the enrollment due to adoption of an extended school year leads to a reduction in the number of school buses required. The size of this reduction will vary in accordance to the type of extended school year plan

PROJECTING SCHOOL BUS REQUIREMENTS FOR CENTRAL SCHOOL DISTRICT "R"

Current no. of school buses.....89

Capacity of school buses.....60 pupils

No. of school bus seats:
(No. of buses 89 X no. of bus seats 60).....5,340

No. of pupils transported..... 13,356

Ratio of bus seats to pupils:
(No. of pupils transported 13,356 divided by no. of school bus seats 5,340.).....1 to 2.5

Year	Regular School Year Needs			Extended School Year Needs		
	Enrollment	Seats Required	Buses Needed	Enrollment	Seats Required	Buses Needed
1970-71	14,048	5,619	94.65	11,260	4,504	75
1971-72	14,623	5,849	97.48	11,720	4,688	78
1972-73	15,173	6,069	101.15	12,160	4,864	81
1973-74	15,597	6,239	104.	12,499	5,000	83.3
1974-75	15,974	6,390	106.5	12,802	5,121	85.4
1975-76	16,238	6,495	108.25	12,912	5,165	86

Shortage with Regular School Year		Shortage or Overage with Cycling	
1st year	5	1st year	14
2nd year	8	2nd year	11
3rd year	12	3rd year	8
4th year	15	4th year	6
5th year	17	5th year	4
6th year	19	6th year	3

adopted and the length of the transition period if the design is based upon acceleration.

With the adoption of the 8-2 cycling plan the school district will have an excess of school buses through 1975. With adoption of the 9-3 plan or 45-15 plan the school bus surplus will be even greater than shown. Without the cycling plan it will be necessary to expand the school bus fleet from the current 89 buses to 108 between 1970 and 1975. The comparative school bus needs for the two patterns of school organization are shown in the following chart. There may be some school board members who will resist the purchasing of additional school buses, but it must be remembered that all cost calculations are based upon establishing an index such as the bus seat ratio. Failure to maintain the ratio will result in a distortion of the costs or dollar savings. Thus, the decision of the school board to use surplus buses to reduce over-crowding or to shorten the distance walkers must go to become eligible for transportation must be considered as an asset acquired through the rescheduling of the school year.

Savings in Capital Outlay for New School Buses

A school board will often have a fight on its hands if it elects to eliminate one or two school buses. While there are some who claim that the saving of $10,000 is something not worth bothering about, the fact remains that budget cuts in transportation can bring opposition from many citizens who are normally 100 per cent behind the school board. The comparison of school bus requirements for a regular school year program and a recommended extended school year program shows a differential of at least 20 school buses for the public school children. Should the ESY program be extended to the parochial school there will be a savings of at least five additional school buses.

A potential reduction of 20 school buses is equal to a savings of at least $200,000 if it is possible to purchase a good 60 passenger bus in the early 1970s for $10,000. Conceivably, the school district will not purchase this number at one time, but in terms of the annual budget the savings will be reflected in the decreased need to purchase three additional buses a year for some time to come. Without cycling the school district will continue to buy 3 or 4 buses annually.

Potential Savings In Instructional Services--Teachers Salaries

There are several other areas where dollar savings may be realized through the rescheduling of the school year, but many of them are of little consequence in comparison to what may be saved in instructional services--teachers salaries. What is saved in this area will depend upon the nature of the extended school year and the nature of teacher contracts. To realize a savings in teacher salaries it is necessary to reduce student enrollment and employ teachers for at least eleven months. Just how dollar savings can be realized is not easy to explain because of the wide variety of employment plans that may be adopted. For example, little, if any, savings can be realized with a cycling plan which allows teachers and students to take the

same vacations. In this situation the savings in other categories is still a profit to the taxpayer.

Field studies have demonstrated that the greatest dollar savings are realized when teachers are employed for eleven months and the students attend school for the equivalent of a ten month school year, one which provides them with 180 instructional days. A school district should be able to save between 10 to 13 percent of the extended school year budget for teachers salaries after teachers have been given a ten percent increase for an eleventh month of service. If a cycling plan is adopted which provides approximately 200 instructional days, it will be necessary to employ teachers under a twelve month contract. This will provide the pupils with a badly needed extra amount of instructional time, but it will require the expenditure of virtually all of the dollar savings realized by a reduction in the number of teachers.

Teacher Pupil Ratios

Current pupil teacher ratios are used to project teacher requirements from 1970 to 1975. The calculations are based upon a study of school district "R's" reports to the state. A more refined set of ratios may be established through a study of individual school staff needs and the way teachers are used. For example, insufficient data about the handicapped pupils made it difficult to adjust the teacher ratios in terms of the small enrollments normally found in classes for the handicapped. Adjustments were made for the half day kindergarten and a rough calculation was made to establish a pupil teacher ratio for special or supportive teachers. The result was the following:

Kindergarten teacher-pupil ratio	1 to 50
Elementary classroom teacher-pupil ratio	1 to 22.69
Supportive staff, elementary school ratio	1 to 117.87
Junior-Senior high school classroom teacher-pupil ratio	1 to 15.73
Supportive staff, secondary school ratio	1 to 80.33

Modification of these ratios upwards or downwards will affect the projected dollar savings. However, it must be understood that all cost studies must show comparative teacher needs for both regular and extended school year programs based upon use of a common yardstick. If class sizes are increased with the regular school year program, fewer teachers will be required. Similarly, a decrease in class size with the extended school year program will increase the number of teachers required and thereby use up a portion of the projected dollar savings. If future cost studies are made recognition must be given to the class size issue.

CLASSROOM TEACHER REQUIREMENTS FOR CENTRAL SCHOOL DISTRICT "R"

WITH THE REGULAR SCHOOL YEAR CALENDAR 1970-75

Category	1970-71	1971-72	1972-73	1973-74	1974-75	1975-76
Projected no. of kdg. children	1268	1268	1268	1268	1268	1268
Projected no. of kdg. teachers	25	25	25	25	25	25
Projected no. of pupils in grades 1-6	7178	7198	7194	7173	7044	6917
Projected no. of teachers in grades 1-6 (ratio 1 to 22.69)	316.4	317.2	317.0	316.1	310.4	304.8
Projected no. of supportive staff (ratio 1 to 117.87)	60.9	61.1	61.0	60.9	59.8	58.7
Projected no. of handicapped children	____	____	____	____	____	____
Projected no. of teachers for handicapped.	____	____	____	____	____	____
Total No. of Teachers Required for Grades K-6	402.3	403.3	403.0	402.0	395.2	388.5

CLASSROOM TEACHER REQUIREMENTS FOR CENTRAL SCHOOL DISTRICT "R"

WITH THE REGULAR SCHOOL YEAR CALENDAR 1970-71

Secondary School Needs

Category	1970-71	1971-72	1972-73	1973-74	1974-75	1975-76
Projected no. of secondary school pupils	5501	6050	6604	7049	7555	7846
No. of teachers required for grades 7-12 (15.73)	349.7	384.6	419.8	448.1	480.3	498.8
No. of supportive staff members required for gr. 7-12 (Ratio 1 to 80.33)	68.5	75.3	82.2	87.8	94.0	97.7
No. of handicapped children	—	—	—	—	—	—
No. of teacers required for handicapped children	—	—	—	—	—	—
Total no. of teachers required for grades 7 to 12.	418.5	459.9	502.0	535.9	574.3	596.5

CLASSROOM TEACHER REQUIREMENTS FOR CENTRAL SCHOOL DISTRICT "R"

WITH THE EXTENDED SCHOOL YEAR CALENDAR 1970-71

Elementary School Needs

Category	1970-71	1971-72	1972-73	1973-74	1974-75	1975-76
Projected no. of kdg. children in the RSY.	1268	1268	1268	1268	1268	1268
Projected no. of kdg. children in the ESY	1014	1014	1014	1014	1014	1014
Projected no. of kdg. teachers required for ESY	20	20	20	20	20	20
Projected no. of children in gr. 1-6 in the RSY	7178	7198	7194	7173	7044	6917
Projected no. of children in gr. 1-6 in the ESY	5742	5758	5755	5738	5635	5534
Projected no. of classroom teachers required with ESY	253	254	254	253	248	244
Projected no. of supportive teachers required with ESY	49	49	49	49	48	47
No. of handicapped children	—	—	—	—	—	—
No. of teachers required for handicapped children						
Total no. of elementary teachers required for K to 6	322	323	323	322	316	311

CLASSROOM TEACHER REQUIREMENTS FOR CENTRAL SCHOOL DISTRICT "A"

WITH THE EXTENDED SCHOOL YEAR CALENDAR 1970-75

Secondary School Needs

Category	1970-71	1971-72	1972-73	1973-74	1974-75	1975-76
Projected no. of secondary school pupils- with ESY	5501	6050	6604	7049	7555	7846
Projected no. of secondary school pupils with ESY	4400	4840	5283	5639	6044	6277
Projected no. of classroom teachers with ESY	280	308	336	358	384	399
Projected no. of supportive staff with ESY	55	60	66	70	75	78
No. of handicapped children	--	--	--	--	--	--
No. of teachers for handicapped	--	--	--	--	--	--
Total No. of Secondary School Teachers	335	368	402	428	459	477

PROJECTED TEACHER SALARY COSTS FOR CENTRAL SCHOOL DISTRICT "R"

WITH THE REGULAR SCHOOL YEAR CALENDAR

Elementary School Costs

Category	1970-71	1971-72	1972-73	1973-74	1974-75	1975-76
No. of elementary teachers required	402	403	403	402	395	389
Average teacher salary for 10 mos.	9,111	9,567	10,045	10,547	11,074	11,628
Allowance for retirement @20%	1,822	1,913	2.009	2,109	2,215	2,326
Social security costs @ 5%	455	478	502	527	554	581
Total 10 month teacher salary cost to Board	11,388	11,958	12,556	13,183	13,843	14,535
Projected cost of elementary teacher salaries.	$4,577,976	4,819,074	5,060,068	5,299,566	5,467,985	5,654,115

Secondary School Costs

No. of secondary teachers required	419	460	502	536	574	597
Average teacher salary for 10 mos.	9,782	10,271	10,785	11,324	11,890	12,485
Allowance for retirement @20%	1,956	2,054	2,157	2,265	2,378	2,497
Social Security costs @ 5%	489	514	539	566	595	624
Total 10 month teacher salary cost to Board	12,227	12,839	13,481	14,155	14,863	15,606
Projected cost of secondary teacher salaries.	5,123,113	5,905,940	6,767,462	7,587,080	8,531,362	9,316,782

PROJECTED TEACHER SALARY COSTS FOR CENTRAL SCHOOL DISTRICT "R"

WITH THE EXTENDED SCHOOL YEAR CALENDAR

Elementary School Costs

Category	1970-71	1971-72	1972-73	1973-74	1974-75	1975-76
No. of elementary teachers required	322	323	323	322	316	311
Average teacher salary for 10 mo.	9,111	9,567	10,045	10,547	11,074	11,628
Allowance for retirement @ 20%	1,822	1,913	2,009	2,109	2,214	2,326
Social security costs @ 5%	456	478	502	527	554	581
Total 10 month teacher salary cost	11,389	11,958	12,556	13,183	13,842	14,535
Teacher salary for extra month	911	957	1,004	1,055	1,107	1,163
Retirement allowance for 1 month	228	239	251	264	277	291
Salary cost for an extra month	1,139	1,196	1,255	1,319	1,384	1,454
Total 11 month teacher salary cost	12,528	13,154	13,811	14,502	15,226	15,989
Total salary cost of elementary sch. teachers with the ESY program -an eleven month contract.	$4,034,416	$4,461,953	$4,801,416			
		$4,243,742	$4,669,644		$4,972,579	

PROJECTED TEACHER SALARY COSTS FOR CENTRAL SCHOOL DISTRICT "R"

WITH THE EXTENDED SCHOOL YEAR CALENDAR 1970 to 1975

Secondary School Teacher Costs

Category	1970-71	1971-72	1972-73	1973-74	1974-75	1975-76
No. of secondary teachers required	335	368	402	428	459	477
Average teacher salary for 10 mo.	9,782	10,271	10,785	11,324	11,890	12,485
Allowance for retirement @20%	1,956	2,054	2,157	2,265	2,378	2,497
Social security costs @5%	489	514	539	566	595	624
Total 10 month teacher salary cost	12,227	12,839	13,481	14,155	14,863	15,606
Teacher salary for 1 extra month	978	1,027	1,079	1,132	1,189	1,249
Retirement allowance for extra month	196	205	216	227	238	250
Total 11 month teacher salary cost	13,401	14,071	14,776	15,514	16,290	17,105
Total salary cost for Secondary Sch. teachers in ESY program-11 month contract.	$4,489,335	$5,178,128	$5,939,952	$6,639,992	$7,477,110	$8,159,085

Projecting Teacher Needs for the Early 1970s

The projection of elementary teacher needs shows a gradual decline in the number of teachers required for both the RSY and ESY programs due to a potential reduction in the number of students entering school. For example, the elementary teacher requirements with the RSY program decrease from 402 teachers in 1970 to 388.5 in 1975. Similarly, the ESY staff reduces from 322 to 311. In contrast the increasing secondary school enrolments shows a need for additional teachers. With the RSY program the staff will increase from 418.5 to 596.5. With the ESY program the staff will increase from 335 to 477.

These projections are based upon the adoption of the 8-2 cycling plan which calls for a 20% reduction in the total school enrollment. Adoption of the 9-3 or 45-15 plan would reduce enrollments by 25%, thereby setting the stage for a greater staff reduction than has been shown in the accompanying tables.

Potential Dollar Savings in Teacher Salaries with Teachers Employed on an Eleven Month Basis

The assumption has been made that teachers will be employed under a new eleven month contract. The ten month salary has been increased by ten percent with allowances for retirement and other fringe benefits built into the new contract. In the interest of brevity and simplicity, the figures reported below were not refined to reflect several fringe benefit savings. Actually, the entire issue of the nature of the contract and the employment practices recommended will have to be covered in another presentation. May it suffice to say that approximately one million dollars can be saved in 1970 in professional teaching staff salaries. This savings will increase to approximately 1,800,000 in 1975.

POTENTIAL DOLLAR SAVINGS IN TEACHER SALARIES

	1970-71	1971-72	1972-73	1973-74	1974-75	1975-76
Elementary savings	543,560	570,332	598,105	629,622	666,569	681,536
Secondary savings	633,778	727,812	827,510	947,078	1,054,252	1,157,697
Composite saving	1,177,338	1,298,144	1,325,615	1,576,700	1,720,821	1,839,233

In summary, the rescheduling of the school year can lead to dollar savings if economy is a major goal. The figures used can be refined, but the results should be the same if common yardsticks are used to measure RSY and ESY costs.



DINNER SESSION

Presiding: Herbert J. Edwards
Assistant to the Director
Bureau of Curriculum Development
and Evaluation
Pennsylvania Department of Education

MONDAY DINNER SESSION

Presiding: Herbert J. Edwards

Our speaker this evening needs no introduction because you already know him as the Director of this National Seminar on Year-Round Education. He is also chairman of the Pennsylvania State Committee on Year-Round Education and a member of the Pennsylvania Education Association Committee on Year-Round Education. He is Director of the Research-Learning Center at Clarion State College which is planning a research-demonstration model of a Flexible All-Year School. This program is described in one of the booklets which was included in your packet of registration materials. It was described as the feature article of the February, 1970, issue of the PSEA Journal.

It is my pleasure to introduce to you at this time our speaker, Dr. John McLain.

DINNER SESSION

Address: Dr. John D. McLain
Chairman
Pennsylvania State Committee on
Year-Round Education

MAJOR THRUSTS FOR YEAR-ROUND EDUCATION

John McLain
Research-Learning Center
Clarion State College

We American people expect much from our schools. It is the task of the schools to help prepare our children and youth to live intelligently and productively in our technologically advanced, rapidly changing society. The schools are expected to discover and to cultivate the talents and capacities of the child, and to assist in his growth to a mature, creative and productive adult capable of making choices and taking actions essential to self-fulfillment, to the enhancement of our society, and to the survival of the world. In the history of mankind no other society has ever expected so much of its schools.

With the help of its education system our society has created a level of education that has made possible, and helped implement scientific discovery and technological development that gives us the power to intervene in the processes of nature with such great force that we can literally destroy the life-sustaining capacity of the earth we live on, or we can enhance the quality of our environment and give greater meaning to the dignity and worth of the individual human being. The quality of our schools will have much to do with the kinds of choices and decisions that will be made in the future. In the history of mankind never has the success or failure of the school had the potential for such profound and far-reaching impact on society and the future of manking.

Whether our schools succeed or fail depends upon all of us. In a free society it is the citizens who must bear the ultimate responsibilities for the choices that are made and the actions that are taken which determine the future of that society.

Our society, through its value systems, has shaped and shall continue to shape our schools. Our schools, in turn, help shape our society. Through this process our society has risen to great heights technologically but has created severe problems ecologically.

Human ecology, basically, is the analysis of the interrelationships between man and his environment. Man is complex; his environment is complex; and the interrelationships are complex; so human ecology is very complex. Our schools are an important part of our environment with which we interrelate. What our schools are, why they are what they are, and what they should be are also complex. But a simplified ecological anaylsis of our school situation will point out some of the pressures for year-round education today.

In early America 19 out of 20 people had to work at the tasks of growing food and making cloth. This included children, and schools, at best, were part-time with the primary role of teaching the 3 R's.

People with ideas invented machines to make it easier and faster to produce yarn and cloth. Other people with ideas invented farm machines such as the gang plow, planter and harvester so a farmer could manage a larger farm. It took fewer people to grow food and make cloth at home so part of the people could do other things. Some of them built factories to make cloth and farm implements. Factories employed people and cities grew around them. Other people built transportation systems to handle the raw materials and the finished products. Some built distribution and marketing systems so people could use what was being produced. Local and State governments were formed and laws were passed to make this free enterprise system work. Schools were built, to teach not only the 3 R's, but about the American way of life that was emerging - about the production, transportation, distribution and marketing systems; about the opportunities people had in this new land; about the government and how it worked for our society; about using farm machinery and keeping it working, and about preserving foods so fruits and vegetables could be eaten all year so people could be healthier.

As the accumulated knowledge of our society increased so did the scientific discovery and technological development which, in turn, demanded an even higher level of knowledge. The more complex and interrelated our society became, the more education the people needed in order to understand and to improve these interrelationships. Thus, our society is living, growing, and changing. Our schools are an integral part of this process and must change with society.

Although less than 5% of our youth graduated from high school at the turn of the century, about 80% graduate now.

The length of the school year was 100 to 120 days at the turn of the century. Now it is 180 to 200 days.

The basic curriculum was the 3 R's at the turn of the century. Now it is broad including many courses in science, social science, language, health and physical education, fine arts, and other fields in addition to the 3 R's with advanced training equivalent to college level in many cases.

The changes in our schools have been immense and in keeping with other advancements of our society. But the goals of survival and enhancement of mankind cannot be achieved by the use of techniques, processes, and tools that were designed for a much lesser task. The rate and magnitude of change which our society is undergoing is unprecedented; therefore, so must be the rate and magnitude of change in our schools.

Out of this struggle to adapt our schools to the changing needs of our society, three sets of basic forces are exerting pressure for year-round schools and involve society's educational, sociological and economic values.

First is the demand for quality education. The length of the school year has increased in the past as the amount of education each student is expected to acquire has increased. Many educators believe it must continue to increase with the explosion of knowledge and the increase in number of social problems that need to be studied. There are other concerns about quality education that relate to the school calendar. Students who can learn well but learn slowly should have the time they need to learn. Students who learn rapidly should not be held back to wait for others. A student who plans to continue his formal learning through college and perhaps graduate school before entering his chosen profession may benefit from an accelerated program with early graduation. Yet, a student who plans to go to work when he leaves high school may not be able to find employment at age 16 or 17. He should be able to pursue appropriate learning in school until he is acceptable on the labor market. From the educational standpoint the number of years in school should vary with the individual depending on the need. Each student should be expected to remain in school until he is able to do something more productive, and he should be allowed to leave school when he is able to do something more worthwhile.

A student may need time out of school during crucial periods in his life. Moving from one community to another, extended illness, exciting opportunities to travel or to explore significant ideas, or conflict with authority may be situations when a student would benefit most by being out of school for a period of time and with an opportunity to return to school whenever his personal situation warrants it without severe loss of continuity in his learning program.

The second set of forces are sociological. The most discussed are the undesirable features of the long summer vacations. Many mothers are greatly relieved when their children go back to school in September after being around the house all summer needing to be supervised and wanting to be entertained. City officials and many citizens have learned to dread the hot summer days when the youth are on the streets with little to do except to get in trouble. Perhaps the youth, themselves, dread these wasteful, uncomfortable times most of all.

School systems that have attempted to initiate a required summer school program, however, have learned many students have other commitments during part or all of the summer. Management in industry depends heavily upon teachers and older students to replace workers on vacations. Many children look forward with great anticipation to the part of the summer when they go to camp or pursue other special interests. The family vacation is one of the few treasured times left in the year when the family really has a chance to enjoy activity together.

During much of the "free" time of the summer vacations, children occupy themselves by playing with friends and neighbors in their homes and on the streets. Parks and recreation centers have been developed to provide them a place to go and things to do.

Other sociological situations, though more subtle, are also important. Parents' vacations are getting longer, more frequent and are being scheduled at different times of the year, not just in summer as in the past. If the family vacation is to prevail, children will need to be out of school when their parents get their vacations at different times of the year.

As an example of the changing vacation patterns, the steelworkers of America receive from one to four weeks vacation annually. Beginning in 1969 they receive $30 per week bonus while on vacation so they will have money to spend. In exchange for this, management can schedule their vacations any time of the year instead of just the summertime as was the previous practice. The steelworkers in the upper half of seniority also receive a thirteen-week or three-month vacation every fifth year. These extended vacations are also being scheduled the year around. How will the schools adjust to these changing schedules?

The American society is becoming more affluent and more receptive to the idea of moving from one job to another, either as a company transfer or a new job. More than 20 million children move each year, many of them during the school year. In many cases the parents think that changing schools during the year is too difficult. Families frequently separate temporarily as the father goes to a new job, leaving his wife and children behind until school is out.

These sociological situations relate to the school time structure in two ways. Some changes that are taking place make the present school structure obsolete. At the same time other patterns of social interaction oppose arbitrary changes in the school calendar.

The third set of forces relate to economics. The pressure to economize certainly is a major and legitimate force. Educating children in America is expensive and getting more expensive. The "cost of living" in the classroom may be expected to continue to rise.

Enrolments are increasing. The population explosion provides more children to attend school. As the schools overcome the dropout problem, more students remain in school longer, contributing to increased enrolments.

Increased enrolments require new buildings and equipment. Building costs continue to rise. Interest on bonds continues to rise, also making capital outlay more expensive.

Teaching <u>all</u> children is far more difficult than teaching just those who learn easily. More highly qualified teachers are needed to use improved teaching techniques if all children are to achieve adequately. More and better teaching tools are needed to apply these improved techniques.

Education has become big business. Capital investment and operational budgets are great and getting greater. It is only logical that the American people, the stockholders of this great enterprise, are demanding <u>maximum economic efficiency</u> in this huge investment.

It is also logical that the local citizens, as they drive past empty schoolhouses in the summer, ask themselves, "Why do we close our schools a fourth of the year? Wouldn's it be more economical to operate them all year instead of just three quarters of a year?"

The time structure of the American public school logically should be based on the answers to these three questions:

What school time patterns or schedules are needed to provide quality education with equality in educational opportunity for all children and youth?

What school time patterns or schedules are most acceptable to the people in terms of their sociological needs - their personal, family, and community living patterns?

What school time patterns or schedules provide the greatest economic efficiency?

Each of these questions is interrelated with the other two. Adults want the school schedule to meet their convenience, but will give up some convenience for quality education and economy. They want quality education for their children, but will make some "sacrifices" for economy and convenience. They want economy, but are willing to pay extra for convenience and quality education. As our society reacts to these value-oriented questions they give "shape" to the American public school and the school calendar.

The task of improving education is the business of everyone who is concerned with the future. In a free society it is always the citizens who must bear the ultimate responsibilities for the choices that are made and the actions that are taken.

When so much that is of fundamental importance is at stake, a people with the advanced theoretical knowledge, practical know-how, and economic affluence, which we have, can and must find ways to develop the schools that will fulfill the emergent educational needs of our society.

NOTE:

At this time Dr. McLain presented the "Statement on Year-Round Education" for consideration by the participants. It was adopted as the position paper of the Seminar at the Final Session and is presented in full here.

STATEMENT ON YEAR-ROUND EDUCATION*

It is recognized that the standard 180-day school year as it now prevails in most schools is not universally satisfactory; nor has any operating program for a year-round school yet proved to be universally acceptable.

It is recognized that a plan which may be appropriate in one community situation may not be acceptable in another situation; and that the extended programs which seem to have been most acceptable are those which provided flexibility or optional attendance.

It is recognized that every individual is unique and if each is to learn what he needs to know at his own best rate, the school curriculum must be individualized.

It is recognized that the time schedules of individuals and families are continuing to become more diverse and that a student's time in school must be adaptable to this changing situation.

It is recognized that financial resources of any community, state and the nation are limited and must be allocated on a priority basis and that educational programs, including the school calendar, must be designed to obtain optimum economic efficiency.

It is therefore recommended that each State:

1. Take appropriate action to provide enabling legislation and/or policy permitting flexibility of programming so that various patterns of year-round education may be explored at the local level.

2. Take appropriate action to provide state school aid on a prorated basis for extended school programs.

3. Encourage experimental or exploratory programs for year-round education through financial incentive or grant.

It is recommended that each local school system:

1. Consider ways, including year-round education, in which the educational program can be improved in terms of (a) providing a quality education with equality in educational opportunity, (b) adapting to the community and family living patterns and, (c) attaining optimum economic efficiency.

2. Include representation of those who would be affected by the changes in the school schedule in the planning for a year-round education program, including teachers, parents, students and other interested groups; and provide the public with adequate information about the proposed plan before it is adopted as a mandatory change.

3. Carefully assess the adequacy of the financial resources and current school facilities, including a careful analysis of comparative budgets, before adopting a new schedule.

4. Select and assign staff which will be both effective in terms of the school program and fair and equitable in terms of the demands placed on staff.

5. Carefully develop budgets that will adequately provide for initiating and operating the proposal program and assess adequacy of school facilities before adopting a new schedule. This includes payment to teachers on a prorated basis for additional time worked.

6. Provide, in the initial planning, for the institutionalization of the program if it meets expectations (i.e., do not accept a state, federal or other grant to initiate such a program unless the intent is to adopt it as the regular school schedule if it proves successful and acceptable.)

It is recommended that the U. S. Office of Education and the Education Commission of the States:

1. Encourage experimentation in year-round education.

2. Rigorously examine all year-round education models which seem to be widely acceptable in terms of well-defined, established criteria.

3. Foster the adoption of these plans or models which have demonstrated their value and acceptability so that nationwide patterns may emerge that are compatible with each other.

*Adopted by the Second National Seminar on Year-Round Education at the Final Session, April 7, 1970.

COMMENTS BY REACTOR PANEL

Mrs. Mary Jane Smith, Teacher
Cheltenham, Pennsylvania, and Member,
PSEA Year-Round Education Committee

Mr. William H. Dunlap, Coordinator of
Secondary Education, Hempfield Area School
District, Greensburg, Pennsylvania, and
Member, PSEA Year-Round Education
Committee

Dr. Charles Wilson, Supervising Principal,
Kutztown Area Schools
Kutztown, Pennsylvania, and Member,
PSEA Year-Round Education Committee

Glen Hess, President
Pennsylvania Association of Sch. Administrators, and
Superintendent of Schools
Washington, Pennsylvania

Mrs. Pat Bennett, Regional Vice-President
Pennsylvania Parent-Teacher Association

Albert Unger, Assistant Director for
Legislative Services,
Pennsylvania School Board Association

What about the busing situation? Will we have to make special concessions because of this? How much is it going to cost me? This is a big item. These three questions are in the foreground and will be in the minds of many parents as soon as they hear about this. I can almost hear them echoed throughout Pennsylvania, especially in the area where this conference is being held, for there will no doubt be comments in the newspapers.

There is a great deal of talk among parents but many times they do not express their feelings as readily as they should. It would be quite helpful if a questionnaire or survey sampling parental attitudes could be made before too much time was spent formulating plans.

From all I have heard on Year-Round Education, including what I have heard at this conference, it is economical. I am going to leave that to the administrators and the statisticians to investigate. I would like to look at it from some other angles. I've had the opportunity this year to work in our area on differentiated staffing. We are studying ways to improve the quality of education through many aspects. Year-Round Education, in my opinion, is another approach to better education for children and to

recognizing classroom teachers as true professionals. Today in one of our groups, you heard about the self-contaminated classroom. And I think it is time we got out of that self-contaminated classroom. I think through Year-Round Education we could do that. Perhaps, you have heard of self-contaminated classroom described a little further, it's like a bikini. What it reveals is interesting, but what it hides is vital. The classroom teacher is no longer a 2 by 4 by 6 teacher. Between two covers of a book, four walls of a classroom and six periods a day. I think that we can recognize individuals as human beings. The children and the teachers both need time to laugh and time to think and time to plan. Ole sands of NEA says, Thursday should be for thinking. In Massachusetts they take Wednesdays, but I would settle for either Wednesday or Thursday.

We need to individualize instruction for children. I think that we must recognize teachers as individuals too. I feel that in Year-Round Education with time to think and time to plan that a teacher could retain her vitality if we really revamp the curriculum and don't try to have Year-Round Education right on top of what we are doing now.

We must begin where the learner is, but we must also begin where the teacher is. We must help her or him and I do wish there were a few more hims, especially at the elementary level to adjust to meaningful quality education. Teacher Education Institutions must educate teachers to use the improved techniques. Other than the way they were taught when they went to school.

Children need not memorize and spit back the information, they must learn to think and to live. They must learn to respect one another. And this year I've had the opportunity of teaching a pilot course in Social Studies, "Man, A Course of Study." The question in that course is, "What Makes Man Human"?

Perhaps, through Year-Round Education, we would have time to figure out what makes man human. And I can't stop without reacting to something else that was said here, too. I would hate to have you all frightened by Year-Round Education and collective bargaining as a straight jacket. I like to call it professional negotiation and I think that we can all work in that area. Thank you.

Mr. Herbert J. Edwards, PDE, Harrisburg

Thank you panel. From a purely personal observation...I have four children of school age, and none are very expert in matters of this sort. I hope that Year-Round Education doesn't come to the West Shore School District until my four are out of school, because they have threatened to beat me up. They are getting to the age that they are almost capable of doing that.

There was a reference to a publication put out by the Department on Year-Round Education, the work of a former employe of the department who has just recently taken a job as a Chief School Administrator, Dr. Edward Grissinger. Dr. Grissinger will be available in case any of you want any further information.

LUNCHEON SESSION

Presiding: Tillman E. Wenk
Assistant Director, Division of
Planning and EDC
Bureau of Curriculum Development
and Evaluation
Pennsylvania Department of Education

FINAL SESSION

Presiding: Tillman E. Wenk

Mr. Tillman Wenk:

It is on record another conference will be held next year. Dale Weizenecker, Assistant Superintendent of Instruction from Brevard County will outline plans for next year.

Dr. Dale Weizenecker:

First, I would like to take advantage of the opportunity to congratulate Dr. McLain on this very successful conference. It is a tribute to his administrative ability and the great staff he must have.

It has been very well attended and participants have had great expertise on the subject. It's quite a challenge to try to do a better job next year than was done this year.

However, we accept the challenge and you know we put some things up pretty high down there in Brevard. We'll see if we can attach this thing on a missile launch for you when you come to Brevard County next year. I certainly want to extend an invitation to all of you. All of the details have not been worked out regarding what agencies might be cooperating and serving as hosts. We feel strongly, we have reason to believe that the State Department of Education in Florida probably will join with Brevard County Public Schools in hosting the conference. Dr. White will serve as Director.

The community where the conference will be held is Cocoa Beach. It is in Brevard County, the State of Florida. I'd like to see the 11 people that voted against it. I'd be interested in knowing why they don't want to. I didn't know we had 11 people from California, but maybe we did. We are going to have to work hard to have a better professional conference than this one was.

Mr. Wenk:

Coming in this morning, I heard a statement in the lobby that amused me, or somewhat bothered me. One man talking to another said there were a lot of men on the program. He didn't say anything further to explain what he meant. I tried to figure this out on my way upstairs. I thought maybe he was right, however, because yesterday there were so many men on the platform one fell off the end...maybe he was thinking about going home where his secretary or his wife keep him in line and always get the last word in. He isn't used

to all these men! I suppose the planners took this into consideration because next on the program is a lady. She is going to get the last word in and it will make you fellows feel so much at home that you won't mind so much leaving We have with us, Dr. Ann Grooms, the Executive Director of the Educational Services Institute in Cincinnati and she's had lots of various educational experience.

Dr. Grooms has worked in the University level at Kettering Foundation. She was a teacher, a principal, Assistant Superintendent of the Middle School and at the moment there is a new publication coming out called "Dynamics, Motivation and the School Administrator". Dr. Grooms -

LUNCHEON SESSION

Address: Dr. Ann Grooms
Executive Director
Educational Services Institute
Cincinnati, Ohio

SUMMARY OF THE CONFERENCE

by

Dr. Ann Grooms

Distinguished platform guests and fellow participants, it is a pleasure to be here. Yesterday, I was called, "Shorty" all day and today I've been told I can have only a partial last word. In this regard, I have also been instructed that my remarks are limited to 3½ minutes, preferably three. I will try. As I moved through the groups yesterday and again today, I found some things going on that impressed me as an educator. And I heard a lay citizen say that they were impressed with being involved and being permitted to be involved with the planning for education. Any program that we are designing to provide a continuous learning environment or program for students must be customized to the local community. So says Lieutenant Governor Broderick yesterday, and I heard this restated by everybody - from the school board member, Mrs. Purvis to superintendents to teachers and education planners. And we heard Dr. McLain speak about planning relevant education for our students. And if we put this together with the unique design for each community, I think we will begin to see other emerging programs, such as we have heard about at Valley View, Illinois; Atlanta and Fulton County, Georgia; Green Chimneys, New York; St. Charles, Missouri; Northville, Utica; and Port Huron, Michigan, the laboratory schools of the University of Florida and Mankato State University as well as the Grand Forks program in North Dakota and the Butler, Chester County and Oil City, Pennsylvania. The extended school year, I think, is taking a systematics approach to relevancy. We have been talking about some materials in the curriculum to redesign a program for individual learners where a teacher may diagnose and prescribe. They can design that program for an individual student and not as a group of students. And all of the topics of materials are going to be available and are being developed. Media, technology, individualized learning packages and commercial materials. And as we take a look at the systematic approach to relevancy with materials, we also take a look at procedures, staffing, teams of teachers, differentiated staffing, both administrators and professional teachers. Students, as we take a look at them individually in small groups, in dealing with their own basic learnings. The personnel being the professional staff have different kinds of talents. So we are talking about matching teaching styles and individual learning styles to the professionals who are in our schools.

We are talking about motivating youngsters, and providing an environment in which they can continue to learn, from ages three to ninety-three. Learning cannot go on just in the four corners of the classroom. Time may be locked into fifty-two weeks, where appropriate vacations are given by the school system. There may be summer, winter and spring vacations and then vacation planned by parents who find their needs designed for them. So the feasibility

of Year-Round Education Programs has to be approached in the systematic manner. And I heard General Reed from Wyoming saying that this is one of the vehicles whereby we people in education can use to bring about program change.

I heard George Jensen talking about the strength that we must have as educators and as lay citizenry to go ahead and do that job, that we have to do in building new patterns for school attendance. I heard Mrs. Tully, a former PTA member and our present school board member saying, we lay people want to help and I would have to add to that, I would not like to be a school person without the hand and right arm of my PTA. And so in the two days that we have been here together, we talked about many things. We dream of dreams. We plan programs. We thought thoughts, and all for one thing, and that's the young person in our charge. Those youngsters who are going to be leaders of tomorrow. Those youngsters that we are going to provide an environment for, to make it relevant to them. Hopefully, if we can provide that kind of environment, the compulsory school attendance laws will not just be that. It will be an open environment whereby all students may learn, grow and develop. Thank you.

Mr. Willman Wenk

One last speaker here. Conclusions on the conference. This man is an expert on drawing conclusions and I know, he's my boss. So, John Kennedy, Director of the Bureau of Curriculum Development and Evaluation.

Mr. John L. Kennedy

A few housekeeping details. We've had a lot of requests for tapes and speeches. We have a list of all your names and addresses. Within a week you will be getting a letter from us, outlining the procedure to follow to order tapes. The name of the person to send it to. In the near future, you will be getting a complete publication of this conference, with all of the various addresses, presentations, printed. But you will be getting a letter within a week outlining what the procedure is. I'd like to at this time thank the trememdous support that we have had of people. I think it is very gratifying that we have had 22 different states represented at this conference. I think that is excellent. I want to particularly thank Dr. McLain and his staff at Clarion and particularly the woman who manned the registration area out there and saw to our every needs, night and day. Well maybe not everyone but. I also want to thank the department staff who cooperated in this joint venture, without them it would have been impossible to put it on. It's really a different type of conference than I attended last week. Last week I was down in Washington at the National Advisory Council, Title III. That was really bad. It reminded me of a bunch of cattle moving around trying to find another bull. Well, that is all they got, a lot of bull. This conference had a lot of good things come out of it. And I don't believe you are like a bunch of cattle moving around, as we saw last week. People have said, someone said that education and educators have rigor mortis and they don't know it. I'm not convinced of this after this conference and I hope you will go out and tell people how flexible you are. Because we need this in education, trememdously. The time is very fast approaching, very fast approaching when these ideas that you have been talking about and working on are going to be accepted by the public, by the consumer. We need the good development work done now, and I would urge all state departments to urge their staffs in assisting you in this work, this good development work. Thank you again for coming. I am very happy to co-host this with Clarion State College. We hope it is not going to be the last. I think we look forward to the third one next year and we hope it continues years after year. We look forward to hosting again in 48 years. Thank you.

APPENDIX A

Seminar Evaluation Report

EVALUATION REPORT

Completed by Participants Tuesday, April 7, Attending Sma[ll] Sessions)

. To what extent do you feel the purposes of this semina[r] [w]n achieved?

a. Consideration of the urgency for school reform.

29 very well 57 reasonably well 3 poorly at all

b. Analysis of various year-round school plans.

32 very well 50 reasonably well 5 poorly at all

c. First hand reports about year-round programs.

44 very well 44 reasonably well 2 poorly at all

d. Opportunity to discuss issues about year-round edu[cation] th those involved in the "movement."

45 very well 41 reasonably well 3 poorly at all

Do you favor the adoption of a statement on year-round [education] by this seminar to be presented to State legislature, Departme[nt of Edu]cation, educational associations and other appropriate groups? [yes] no

If the answer to the above is "yes," please answer the [following] question:

As a procedure for adopting a statement which do you f[avor]

4 Plan A: Go over the proposed "Statement on Yea[r-Round Ed]ucation" point by point and work out the exact wording [of the] tement at the luncheon session before adoption. (This is [very] ficult in a large group situation.)

76 Plan B: Go over the proposed "Statement on Yea[r-Round Ed]ucation" point by point and adopt the basic ideas, have [those] wishes to submit in writing at the seminar any propose[d changes] in wording, then have the Pennsylvania State Committee on [Year-Round] Education work out the semantics, considering the recomme[ndations] ubmitted.

3 Plan C: Other (Please describe)

Do you favor the continuation of the National Seminar o[n Year-Round] nd Education as an organization to promote and to help give directi[on to the] ear-round education movement? 90 yes 0 no

If the answer to the above question is yes, would you f[avor the] establishment of a membership open to those wishing to belong to rec[eive] lic informa-tion about current developments in year-round educatio[n]? [yes] 6 no

This is the Second National Seminar on Year-Round Educ[ation]. [The] first was held in Arkansas and was organized by Dr. Wayne White who i[s] [Superi]ntendent of Schools at Brevard County, Florida. He has invited th[e] [Nat]ional Seminar on Year-Round Education to be held in Florida (with the p[ossibility] of a tour of Cape Kennedy and the new Disneyland.) What is your o[pinion] t that? 71 accept the invitation 11 hold the seminar some place [else] don't have another one

APPENDIX B

Proposed Statement on the Year-Round School
by the
Association of Classroom Teachers
National Education Association

PROPOSED STATEMENT ON THE YEAR-ROUND SCHOOL*

The National Education Association recognizes that, although potential values may be gained from rescheduling the school year, the extension of the school year may not in and of itself necessarily be in the best interest of the students and the community. The NEA recognizes further that no one model for the year-round school is universally desirable or applicable but rather that each school district should vary the design of its school year to fit its own needs. Therefore, the NEA urges its state and local affiliates to take the initiative --

1. In exploring the many ways the school year might be extended to accomplish specific goals (remedial, enrichment, acceleration, recreational, etc.) for students.

2. In examining ways to provide for maximum use of school facilities by the community as a whole.

3. In identifying the advantages and disadvantages of each proposal.

4. In considering the legal implications of a rescheduled school year (e.g.: Do state laws permit flexibility of programming and use of state school aid for an extended school year?)

5. In assessing the adequacy of the financial resources and current school facilities (e.g.: Is air-conditioning a major factor to be considered in relationship to programs proposed for implementation during the summer months?)

6. In determining ways of selecting and assigning staff which will be both effective in terms of the school program and fair and equitable in terms of the demands placed on staff.

7. In encouraging and helping develop plans for experimentation by the local system in the rescheduling of its school year toward the end that the school system individualize and maximize its school program to best meet the needs of its students and the community.

8. In evaluating carefully the results of the experimentation and providing basic facts for further consideration.

9. In providing for incorporation into the regular school program of those models of the extended year which indicate value through experimentation.

10. In keeping the public informed and involved as the plans and possible implementation of an extended year are conceived and developed

---

* This statement has been prepared by the Association of Classroom Teachers at the request of the NEA Executive Committee and is being referred to the latter group for official action.

The NEA maintains that all concerned parties--representatives of the local professional association including classroom teachers from the various grade levels, administrators, board of education, and key community groups--must be involved from the beginning in exploring and implementing any program for extending the school year.

The NEA believes that, regardless of the models designed for experimentation and their ultimate implementation, the local association has a responsibility to its members to negotiate compensation on a prorata basis of the contracted year for those teachers engaged by the school district for services beyond the regular school year.

The NEA recommends that The Rescheduled School Year (NEA Research Summary 1968-S2)--which (a) provides historical background, (b) summarizes the benefits and problems identified to date by school systems which have extended the school year, (c) describes a variety of interesting and significant year-round programs, and (d) lists a comprehensive selected bibliography--be used as a basic resource document in initiating a study of the year-round school.

Endorsed by:

ACT executive committee

Betty I. Buford, President

Donald F. Wilson, President-Elect

Ruby J. Gainer, Vice-President

Birnadine Mack, Secretary

Bruce P. Eckman, Past President

Helen Kovach
North Central Regional Director

Jim A. Roady
Northwest Regional Director

Gary G. Gschwind
Southwest Regional Director

William E. Zeiss
Northeast Regional Director

Evelyn Fuller
Southeast Regional Director

Tommy G. Fulton
South Central Regional Director

Classroom Teacher Advisory Panel

Alvia Barfield
Los Angeles, California

Paul Cole
Lewiston, New York

Barbara B. Tinsley
Richmond, Virginia

Kenneth L. Haller
Reno, Nevada

Willard McGuire
North St. Paul, Minnesota

Raymond Safronoff
Hazel Park, Michigan

Marjory Sharp
Pittsburgh, Kansas

Warren Packer
Yuma, Arizona

Bernard Freitag
Trevose, Pennsylvania

John Duffy
Elgin, Illinois

December, 1969

MS:H:ar
12/69-25

APPENDIX C

Resolution on Year-Round Education
by the
National Conference of Lieutenant Governors

National Conference of Lieutenant Governors
Eighth Annual Meeting
Denver, Colorado
June 28, 1969

II. MODERNIZING THE PRESENT TWELVE-YEAR PATTERN OF PRIMARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION

WHEREAS quality education for all our young people is a cherished goal of all Americans; and

WHEREAS there is growing concern as to the taxpayer cost of supporting primary and secondary education systems as now constituted; and

WHEREAS the response of too many professional educators to the problem is to demand that we constantly spend more and more money while maintaining the same structures of eight years of primary school and four years of high school which has been maintained for more than half a century; and

WHEREAS said structure of twelve years of primary and secondary education has been maintained despite the following phenomena among others, which have occurred during recent decades:

1) The need of college education and in many cases, post-college education to prepare young people to meet the sophistication of modern business, industry and technology - whereas a high school diploma was adequate in most cases, other than the learned professions, fifty years ago -- as a consequence of which the entrance of young people into the Nation's productive work force is delayed until they are twenty-two or twenty-three years of age.

2) Universal military service or its equivalent is a fact of life for most young men, consequently delaying their entry into the Nation's productive work force to twenty-four or twenty-six years of age.

3) All reliable indices indicate that by 1972 half the population of the Nation will be less than twenty-five years of age.

4) The strong and growing trend towards early retirement constantly shrinks the productive work force at the opper end.

5) Desirable and welcome advances in medical science are prolonging the average life span, with concomitant increase in need for taxpayer support; and

WHEREAS the situation as it exists and is projected for the years ahead clearly requires more imaginative and innovative approaches than merely calling

on the already heavily burdened taxpayer for huge annual increases in annual appropriations in state and local budgets for the support of primary and secondary education; and

WHEREAS any major change in the present and ancient twelve year program for primary and secondary education if it is to be undertaken, must as a practical matter be done virtually simultaneously by all the States because of its effect on the entrance age of college freshmen:

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the National Conference of Lieutenant Governors recommends that the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, in cooperation with the Education Commission of the States, give consideration to convening a meeting of appropriate representatives of each of the States to consider the desirability of compressing the twelve-year span of primary and secondary education into a shorter span and to recommend general guidelines for improving the content of curricula, for infusing greater flexibility into educational systems in order to expand the options available to all students -- not merely initially but on a continuing basis throughout their educational preparation -- in preparing themselves for useful, productive and satisfying careers, and to accomplish these desirable changes without compromising the quality of our educational systems.

APPENDIX D

List of Participants
Second National Seminar on Year-Round Education

Dr. Andrew Adams
Director of Educational Affairs, VISTA
Office of Economic Opportunity
Executive Office of the President
Room B-300
Washington, D.C. 20506

Mr. Harold Adams
510 W. Third
Oil City, Pennsylvania 16301

Dr. Sami Alam
Director of Research
Port Huron Public Schools
509 Stanton Street
Port Huron, Michigan 48061

Mr. R E. Alford
910 Wigman Road
Rochester, New York 14624

Mr. C. S. Allen
182 Tremont Street
Boston, Massachusetts 21110

Milton Allison
Connellsville Area School District
Connellsville, Pennsylvania

Mrs. Lucile Baird
Butler Area School District
Administration Building
167 New Castle Road
Butler, Pennsylvania 16001

Dr. Maynard Bauer, Supt.
484 East Avenue
Tallmadge, Ohio 44278

Mr. Jerry Beaver
Director of Secondary Education
New Hanover Schools
Wilmington, N. C.

Dr. Heyward Bellamy, Supt. of Schools
New Hanover County
Wilmington, N. C.

Mrs. Lloyd L. Bennett, Regional V.P.
Pennsylvania Congress of PTA
1020 Lingletown Road
Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17110

Mr. Harry Benedetto
Curriculum Development Specialist
Bureau of Curriculum Dev. & Eval.
Pennsylvania Department of Education
Box 911
Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17126

D. F. Bissinger
50 Silver Spring Road
Landisville, Pennsylvania

Dr. Charles Boehm
Better Government Associates, Inc.
Payne-Shoemaker Building
Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17101

C. A. Bonomi
1215 Longview Ave.
Aliquippa, Pennsylvania 15001

S. S. Boone
Room 115, Knott Building
Tallahassie, Florida

Helen Brady
School District of the City of Hsb.
1201 N. Sixth Street, P. O. Box 2645
Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17105

Dr. Fred Brieve
Associate Superintendent - Instruction
Dallas Independent School District
3700 Ross Avenue
Dallas, Texas 75204

Mr. Raymond Broderick
Lieutenant Governor of the State of
Pennsylvania
Room 200
Main Capitol
Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17120

Miss Bertha Brosky, Principal
Hope Street
Chartiers Valley Schools
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15220

Mr. John Buch
Assistant Supt. of Schools
County Office Building
Market and New Streets
West Chester, Pennsylvania 19380

Mr. Dennis P. Burke
Education Development Center
California State College
California, Pennsylvania 15419

Mr. Earl Busard
Northville Public Schools
405 West Main Street
Northville, Michigan 48167

Mr. Michael Cammisa
Math Department
Butler Senior High School
Butler, Pennsylvania 16001

Bruce Campbell
407 West State Street
Box 909
Trenton, New Jersey 08605

Nick Campitelli
Assistant Administrator
Richland Schools
Johnstown, Pennsylvania

Mr. Donald M. Carroll, Jr.
Assistant Commissioner of Basic Education
Office of Basic Education
Box 911
Pennsylvania Department of Education
Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17126

C. C. Chase
School Union #27
Hudson, New Hampshire

Dr. Ted Cherry, Ass't Supt.
Reynoldsburg Schools
Reynoldsburg, Ohio 43068

Miss Cheri Crawford
DuBois Area Schools
Luthersburg Elementary School
DuBois, Pennsylvania

R. G. Creasey
Seventh Street
Lancaster, Pennsylvania 17603

William H. Crum
Assistant Supt. of Schools
Charles Summit, Pennsylvania

Andrew Daskivich
Punxsutawney Area School District
P. O. Box 303
Punxsutawney, Pa. 15767

Mrs. J B DeBolt
1312 Hillcrest Road
West Chester, Pennsylvania

R. N. Doepner, Jr.
Box 5, Route 11
Winston-Salem, North Carolina

Mr. William H. Dunlap
Coordinator of Secondary Education
Hempfield Area School District
Greensburg, Pennsylvania

Mr. Herbert J. Edwards
Ass't Director, Bureau of Curriculum
Development and Evaluation
Pennsylvania Dept. of Education
Box 911
Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17126

Mr. Harold Estep
Curriculum Director
Oil City Schools
Box 929
Oil City, Pennsylvania 16301

Mr. Harry Etzel
28 E. Bissell Avenue
Oil City, Pennsylvania

Samuel A. Farmerie
Westminster College
New Wilmington, Pennsylvania

Gaylord Feick
Director of Program Development
Port Huron Public Schools
509 Stanton Street
Port Huron, Michigan 48061

Dr. Paul R. Fiscus
Director Personnel/Federal Programs
459 S. Eberhart Road
Butler, Pennsylvania

J D. Fontana
Box 188
East Montpelier, Vermont

James L. French
Elementary Principal
112 Elmdale Avenue
Clyde, Ohio 43410

J. E Fritz
N. Courtland Street
East Stroudsburg, Pennsylvania 18301

B. W Garner
Grimes State Office Building
Des Moines, Iowa 50319

Ralph Gaudio
Elementary Principal
109 Crescent Heights
New Brighton, Pennsylvania

Dr. James Gemmell, President
Clarion State College
Clarion, Pennsylvania 16214

Ray G. Gilbert
329 Mulberry Street
Clyde, Ohio 43410

Reid Gillis
Coordinator of Year-Round Education
Fulton County Schools
500 County Administration Bldg.
165 Central Avenue, S. W.
Atlanta, Georgia 30303

Dr. Donald Glines
Wilson Campus School
Mankato, Minnesota 56001

Mr. George B. Glinke
Admin. Ass't for Year-Round Education
Administrative Service Center
52188 Van Dyke Avenue
Utica, Michigan 48087

Mr. Richard Gloeckler
Department of Education
West Chester State College
West Chester, Pennsylvania

Frank Gorgonzola
Canandaigua City School District
West Gibson Street
Canandaigua, New York 14424

Edward M. Grissinger
Bureau of Administrative Leadership Services
342 Education Building
Department of Education, Box 911
Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17126

Dr. Ann Grooms
Education Services Institute
3915 Plainville Road
Cincinnati, Ohio 45227

Mr. C D Gurganus
Principal, John T. Harrard H.S.
Wilmington, New Jersey

Harold D Guthrie
2144 Mt. View Ave.
State College, Pennsylvania 16801

Thomas Harder
Richland Schools
Johnstown, Pennsylvania

J. J. Harris
74 W. Beare St.
Washington, Pennsylvania 15301

R B. Harris
3700 Ross Avenue
School Administration Building
Dallas, Texas 75204

Dr. Winslow Hatch
Research Training Branch
Division of Higher Education Research
Bureau of Research
U. S. Office of Education
Washington, D C 20202

Dr. Robert Hays
Ben Salem School District
3330 Hulmville Road
Cornwell Heights, Pennsylvania 19020

H. Clair Henry
Superintendent of Schools
Brookville, Pennsylvania 15825

Fred W. Herlinger
208 Theatre Drive
Johnstown, Pennsylvania 15904

Kenneth Hermansen, Superintendent
Valley View Schools
Lockport, Illinois 60441

B. Anton Hess, Deputy Secretary and
Commissioner for Basic Education
Office of Basic Education
333 Education Building
Pennsylvania Department of Education
Box 911
Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17216

Glen Hess
Superintendent of Schools
Washington, Pennsylvania

R. M. Hileman
Jefferson City
Missouri 65101

J. B Hodges, Director
P. K. Yonge Laboratory School
University of Florida
Gainesville, Florida

H. G. Hollingsworth, Jr.
Director, Office of Admunct Education
State Department of Education
Columbia, South Carolina 29201

Kenneth W Hood, Supt.
Washington West School District
Waterbury, Vermont 05676

Russell L. Horchler, Supt.
116 East St.
New Castle, Pennsylvania 16101

Mr. Thomas Hughes, Elem. Prin.
Butler Area School District
Administration Building
167 New Castle Road
Butler, Pennsylvania 16001

James H. Hughey, Principal
9565 Mercer
Dallas, Texas

James Hysong, Superintendent
Brookville Area Schools
Valley Street Extension
Brookville, Pennsylva

Mrs. M. Innis
Edwin Gould Foundation
109 East 31st Street
New York, N. Y. 10016

Clifford R. Ivey
Board President
519 General Armstrong Rd.
King of Prussia, Pennsylvania

Mr. George Jensen, Chairman
National School Calendar Study Committee
2015 Kenwood Parkway
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55405

Dr. Ernest Johnson, Director
Educational Development Center
Johnstown Campus
University of Pittsburgh
Johnstown, Pennsylvania 15904

Dr. Oz Johnson
Assistant Superintendent for Research
Jefferson County Public Schools
3332 Newburg Road
Louisville, Kentucky 40218

Allan Jones
Connellsville Area School District
Connellsville, Pennsylvania

Robert B. Kautz
Administrative Assistant
Washington West School District
Waterbury, Vermont 05676

T. L. Keeler
139 East Main Street
Canton, Pennsylvania 17724

Mr. John L. Kennedy, Director
Bureau of Curriculum Dev. & Eval.
Pennsylvania Department of Education
503 Education Building
Box 911
Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17126

Charles E King
Director of Research, Fairfax Schools
Page Ave.
Fairfax, Virginia

Mrs. Anna C. Kinzey
Black Hawk Circle
Downingtown, Pennsylvania

T. M Kissel
P. O. Box 186
Latrobe, Pennsylvania 15650

Charles J. Korkuch
Assistant Superintendent
Washington Twp. Public Schools
Hurffville-Crosskeys Rd.
Sewell, N. J.

Francis Korkuch
City of Harrisburg School District
1201 N Sixth Street
P. O. Box 2645
Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17105

Dr. J. F Lagana
200 Hillvue Lane
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15237

Dr. Everett A. Landin, Director
Education Development Center
West Chester State College
110 West Rosedale Ave.
West Chester, Pennsylvania 19380

Mr. Jerome E Lang
2340 Saunder Sta. Rd.
Monroeville, Pennsylvania 15146

Mr. Lawrence M. Large, Assistant Prin.
Manheim Township School District
School Road
Neffsville, Pennsylvania 17556

Howard Lehman
Elementary Supervisor
Oil City Area Scools
Grandview Avenue
Oil City, Pennsylvania

Mrs. Susan Leighton
Policy Planner
Philadelphia School District
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

Fred D. Leonard
Elementary Principal
Chichester School District
Boothwyn, Pennsylvania

William D. Mader
Curr. Dev. Sp., PDE
20 Vesta Dr.
Dauphin, Pennsylvania 17018

Mrs. Ann Manor
Butler Area School District
Administration Building
167 New Castle Road
Butler, Pennsylvania 16001

Charles H. Marston, Consultant, Sec. Ed.
State Department of Education
Concord, New Hampshire

David Martin
Utica Road
R.D. 1
Polk, Pennsylvania

Layton Matchulet
Assistant Superintendent
Oil City Area Schools
833 Grandview Ave.
Oil City, Pennsylvania

Mr. R. O. Mathias
Bower at Moffett Street
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15243

Robert McCarter
Director of Secondary Education
West Chester Area School District
West Chester, Pennsylvania 19380

Dr. T. R. McKague
Assistant Professor
Department of Education Admin.
University of Sask
Saskatoon, Sask., Canada

Mr. Donald S. McKelvey
Ass't Director, Regional Planning
ESEA Title III
Research-Learning Center
Clarion State College
Clarion, Pennsylvania 16214

Dr. John D. McLain, Director
Research-Learning Center
Clarion State College
Clarion, Pennsylvania 16214

Mr. Don Mean, Ass't Director
Educational Development
Research-Learning Center
Clarion State College
Clarion, Pennsylvania 16214

Ms. Carmela Mercurio
Edwin Gould Foundation for Children
109 E. 31st Street
New York, N. Y. 10016

Mr. Schuyler M. Meyer, Jr.
Edwin Gould Foundation for Children
109 E. 31st Street
New York, N. Y. 10016

Mr. Iro C. Mogen
Associate Superintendent
Department of Public Instruction
State Capitol Building
Pierre, South Dakota 57501

Dr. Don L. Morgan
Assistant Director, Field Services
Research-Learning Center
Clarion State College
Clarion, Pennsylvania 16214

Mr. Russel Mosely
Coordinator of Curriculum Development
State Department
Madison, Wisconsin

Mr. A. A. Murphy
County Superintendent of Schools
Clarion County Courthouse
Clarion, Pennsylvania 16214

H. F. Newell
Courthouse
Franklin, Pennsylvania 16323

Dr. Carl A. Newman
Supervising Principal
North Allegheny School District
200 Hill View Lane
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15237

Dr. Stewart North
College of Education
University of Houston
Houston, Texas

James C. Northrop
Assistant Director P. K. Yonge
University of Florida
Gainesville, Florida

Alan M. O'Dell, Principal
St. Charles Schools
1155 Jungs Road
St. Charles, Missouri

Mr. John Ondriezek
P. O. Box 452
Latrobe, Pennsylvania 15650

Albert B. Osborne
106 South Main Street
Clyde, Ohio 43410

Ms. Florence Panattoni
Curriculum Director
Northville Schools
Northville, Michigan 48167

Mrs. Dazimae R. Paul
326 N. Ninth Street
Sunbury, Pennsylvania 17801

Dr. F. L. Penn
Bower at Moffett
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15243

Glen H. Penner
Department of Educ. Admin.
University of Saskatchewan
Saskatoon, Saskatchewan, Canada

H. E. Phillips, Dir.
Division of School Accreditation
Texas Education Agency
Auston, Texas 78711

Larry N. Pineo
State Department of Education
Augusta, Maine

Mrs. Jean Purvis
Board of Education
Butler Area School District
515 N. McKean Street
Butler, Pennsylvania 16001

Mr. A. C. Ramsey
3700 7th Ave.
Altoona, Pennsylvania 16602

J. L. Reed
Central High School
Cheyenne Public School
Cheyenne, yoming

Mrs. Robert Reynolds, President
Pennsylvania Congress of Parents and Teachers
630 Lincoln Avenue
Williamsport, Pennsylvania 17701

Mrs. Dain Riley, President
Jefferson County Council of PTA
7801 Canna Drive
Louisville, Kentucky 40258

Dr. Ernest T. Rice
Assistant Director, College Services
Research-Learning Center
Clarion State College
Clarion, Pennsylvania 16214

Paul C. Raffensperger
Education Evaluation Advisor
Bureau of Curr. Dev. and Eval.
Box 911 Education Bldg.
Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17126

B. M. Robbins
Dupre Drive
Spartansburg, South Caroline

Joseph P. Roberts
Supervisor of Research
State Department of Education
Richmond, Virginia

John S. Rode
360 Spring Lane
King of Prussia, Pennsylvania

Mr. William H. Rodgers, Prin.
1433 Orchardview Drive
Pittsburgh
Pennsylvania 15220

Dr. Richard Romoser
Clarion State College
Clarion, Pennsylvania 16214

Sam Ross, Jr., Headmaster
Green Chimneys School
Brewster, New York 10509

Wilbur Sarvis
High School Principal
1412 Coe Avenue
Clyde, Ohio

Morris Schmoll
Superintendent of Schools
Ludlow, Vermont

Harold E. Schnell
Board of Education
430 E. Pease Ave.
West Carrollton, Ohio

Doug Schoonover
East Stroudsburg High School
East Stroudsburg, Pennsylvania

Everett Seaman
N. Olmsted City School
N. Olmsted, Ohio

Jules DiSerafino
Administrator
Ambler, Pennsylvania

Mr. and Mrs. Paul Shadburn
Dekaulb County Schools
Courthouse Building - Room 801
Decatur, Georgia 30030

R. K. Shafer
3330 Hulmeville Rd.
Cornwell Heights, Pennsylvania 19020

Esther Shaffer
Assitant Principal
123 Woodland Road
Butler, Pennsylvania 16001

Dr. James F Shankweiler, Supt.
Chichester School District
3333 Chichester Ave.
Boothwyn, Pennsylvania 19061

R. L. Shimer
522 Genessee N.E.
Warren, Ohio 44483

Ella Simmons
City of Harrisburg School District
1201 N. Sixth Street
Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17105

Arthur Sinclair
Administrative Assistant, Plum Borough
195 Francis Road
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15239

George Slick
Tredyffrin-East Town School District
Berwyn, Pennsylvania 19312

Mrs. J. T. Smeltzer
279 Alameda Avenue
Youngstown, Ohio

John Sloan
Connellsville Area School District
Connellsville, Pennsylvania

Mrs. Mary Elizabeth Smith
Box 310
Gettysburg, Pennsylvania 17325

Mrs. Mary Jane Smith
Cedarbrook Hill Apt. 701
Wyncote, Pennsylvania 19095

William H. Smith
School Board memeber
213 Woodland Road
Butler, Pennsylvania 16001

Miss Donna Smouse
Luthersburg Elem. School
DuBois Area Schools
DuBois, Pennsylvania

Mr. Bradley Stanton
Canandaigua City School District
West Gibson Street
Canandaigua, New York 14424

Leland B. Stedge
Edwin Gould Foundation for Children
109 E wlst Street
New York, N. Y. 10016

Mr. Robert E. Stillwagon
Admin. Ass't
Bureau of Curriculum Development
and Evaluation
Pennsylvania Department of Education
Room 502 - Education Building
Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17126

Stanton W. Sutphen
Easton Area High School
Easton, Pennsylvania 18042

Mrs. Alice TerHaar
PSEA, Department of Pupil Services
415 Rose Valley Road
Southampton, Pennsylvania 18966

Dr. George Thomas
State Department of Education
Division of Research, Room 776
University of the State of New York
Albany, New York 12224

Robert Thomas
386 Wyoming Ave.
Kingston, Pennsylvania 18704

H. A. Thompson
P. O. Box 186
Warren, Pennsylvania 16365

David Tressler
Butler Area School District
167 New Castle Road
Butler, Pennsylvania

Douglas Troutman
88 Hope Street
Stamford, Connecticut 06906

Mrs. Roberta Tully, Chairman
Board of Education
8605 Cool Brook Court
Louisville, Kentucky

Mrs. Agnes Turnblacer
Butler Area School District
167 New Castle Road
Butler, Pennsylvania

Albert Unger
Ass't. Director for Legislative Serv.
Education Building
Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17126

Mr. A. Donald Vaughan
Centennial Schools
Warminster, Pennsylvania 18974

Ralph Veights, Chairman
Social Studies Department
5036 Clifton Dr.
Aliquippa, Pennsylvania

Robert J. Wagner
High School Principal
Box 170 R.D. 1
Greensburg, Pennsylvania

R. Dale Weizenecker
Ass't Superintendent for Instruction
Brevard County, Florida

Carl F. Welch, Supt.
Reynolds School District
531 Reynolds Road
Greenville, Pennsylvania

Tillman Wenk, Ass't Director
Division of Planning and EDC
501 Education Building
Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17126

Linford Werkheiser
Tredyffrin-East Town School
Berwyn, Pennsylvania 19312

Robert Whitsitt
Edwin Gould Foundation for Children
109 E. 31st Street
New York, N. Y. 10016

Mel Williams
Edwin Gould Foundation for Children
109 E. 31st Street
New York, N. Y. 10016

H. Stanley Wills
Director of Basic Education
Pennsylvania State Education Assoc.
400 N. Third Street Box 1724
Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17105

Dr. Charles Wilson, Supervising Prin.
Kutztown Area Schools
Kutztown, Pennsylvania

Mr. Duane E. Work, Director
Special Programs
431 Stow Street
Cuyahoga Falls, Ohio

Dr. Wayne Worner, Superintendent
Grand Forks Public Schools
Grand Forks, North Dakota 58201

Dr. Arnold Zaeske
Clarion State College
Clarion, Pennsylvania 16214

Richard F. Zani
Superintendent of Schools
Rutland Central District
Proctor, Vermont

Victor V. Zike
Asst. Director of Instruction, Sec.
Penn Hills School District
12200 Garland Drive
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15235

J. Harold Zook
Souderton Area School District
41 N. School Lane
Souderton, Pennsylvania 18964